

JPRS 74889

9 January 1980

Near East/North Africa Report

No. 2065

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Indexes to this report (by keyword, author, personal names, title and series) are available from Bell & Howell, Old Mansfield Road, Wooster, Ohio 44691.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		1. REPORT NO. JPRS 74889	2.	3. Recipient's Accession No.
4. Title and Subtitle NEAR EAST/NORTH AFRICA REPORT, No. 2065			5. Report Date 9 January 1980	
7. Author(s)			8. Performing Organization Rept. No.	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Joint Publications Research Service 1000 North Glebe Road Arlington, Virginia 22201			10. Project/Task/Work Unit No.	
			11. Contract(C) or Grant(G) No. (C) (G)	
12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address As above			13. Type of Report & Period Covered	
			14.	
15. Supplementary Notes				
16. Abstract (Limit: 200 words) This serial report contains information on socioeconomic, government, political, and technical developments in the countries of the Near East and North Africa.				
17. Document Analysis & Descriptors				
Political Science	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Inter-Arab Affairs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Libya	<input type="checkbox"/> Sultanate of Oman	
Sociology	<input type="checkbox"/> North African Affairs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mauritania	<input type="checkbox"/> Syria	
Economics	<input type="checkbox"/> Afghanistan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Morocco	<input type="checkbox"/> Tunisia	
Culture (Social Sciences)	<input type="checkbox"/> Algeria	<input type="checkbox"/> People's Democratic Republic of Yemen	<input type="checkbox"/> United Arab Emirates	
Ethnology	<input type="checkbox"/> Bahrain	<input type="checkbox"/> Persian Gulf Area	<input type="checkbox"/> Western Sahara	
Geography	<input type="checkbox"/> Egypt	<input type="checkbox"/> Qatar	<input type="checkbox"/> Yemen Arab Republic	
Techological	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Iran	<input type="checkbox"/> Saudi Arabia	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Islamic Affairs	
Military Sciences	<input type="checkbox"/> Iraq	<input type="checkbox"/> Spanish North Africa		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Israel	<input type="checkbox"/> Sudan		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Jordan			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Kuwait			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lebanon			
b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms				
c. COBATI Field/Group 5D, 5C, 5K, 15				
18. Availability Statement Unlimited Availability Sold by NTIS Springfield, Virginia 22161		19. Security Class (This Report) UNCLASSIFIED		21. No. of Pages 127
		20. Security Class (This Page) UNCLASSIFIED		22. Price

9 January 1980

NEAR EAST/NORTH AFRICA REPORT

No. 2065

CONTENTS

PAGE

INTER-ARAB AFFAIRS

'Arafat Interviewed on Palestinian Position, Moscow Visit, Tunis Summit (AL-SHA'B, 19 Nov 79)	1
Salah Khalaf Discusses Lebanese Problem, Says Palestinian State Imminent (AL-ANWAR, 2 Nov 79)	8

ISLAMIC AFFAIRS

Implications of Pope's U.S. Visit to Islamic, Arab World Examined (AL-HAWADITH, various dates)	34
Kishk's Article on Visit, by Jalal Kishk Chief Editor's, Farran's Responses Father George Rahmah's Response Dr Taysir Kawwa's Criticism Father Kawkabani Responds to Jalal Kishk Article, by Yuhanna Kawkabani	
Sociologist Analyzes Islam's Challenge to West (Anwar Abdel-Malek Interview; LE MONDE, 9 Dec 79)	66

IRAN

Ayatollah Montazeri Explains Stance Versus United States, Neighboring States (Montazeri Interview; AL-SAFIR, 19 Nov 79)	73
---	----

ISRAEL

Opposition Parties' Destructive Methods Harm Nation (HAZOFEH, 9 Nov 79)	78
--	----

CONTENTS (Continued)

Page

Closure of 'HAZOFEH' Likened to Party Suicide (Editorial; HAZOFEH, 9 Nov 79)	81
Agudat Israel Stand on Abortion Lauded (Editorial; HAZOFEH, 6 Nov 79)	84
Settlers Must Cooperate With Government Policy (Editorial; HAZOFEH, 9 Nov 79)	86
Authority of Public Relations Ministry Must Be Set Down (Editorial; HAZOFEH, 5 Nov 79)	88
New Police Superintendent Faces Many Challenges (Editorial; HAZOFEH, 6 Nov 79)	90
Amos Horev Speaks Out on Current Ordnance Issues (Amos Horev Interview; MA'ARKHOT HIMUSH No 71, Oct 79)	92

LEBANON

Palestinians Agree To Halt Operations From South Lebanon (AL-HAWADITH, 9 Nov 79)	96
Sa'ib Salam, Walid Junblat, Kamil al-As'ad Form Alliance (Walid 'Awad; AL-HAWADITH, 9 Nov 79)	98

LIBYA

Qadhdhafi's African Policy Reviewed, Studied (Bassam Tayyarah; AL-NAHAR AL-'ARABI WA AL-DUWALI, 12-18 Nov 79)	101
---	-----

MAURITANIA

Circumstances Engulfing Ould Daddah's Release Discussed (Huda al-Husayni; AL-HAWADITH, 2 Nov 79)	105
---	-----

MOROCCO

Effects of U.S. Decision To Supply Country With Weapons Discussed (Sulayman al-Farzali; AL-HAWADITH, 2 Nov 79)	108
--	-----

CONTENTS (Continued)

Page

Human Rights Violations Decried (AL-MUHARRIR, 18 Nov 79)	114
Interior Minister Questioned on Persecution of USFP by Local Authorities (AL-MUHARRIR, 26 Nov 79)	116
Conditions at Branch of Cadi Ayad School Revealed (Beni Mellal; AL-MUHARRIR, 29 Nov 79)	121
Bar Association Denounces Arrest of Lawyers (AL-MUHARRIR, 29 Nov 79)	123

'ARAFAT INTERVIEWED ON PALESTINIAN POSITION, MOSCOW VISIT, TUNIS SUMMIT

Algiers AL-SHA'B in Arabic 19 Nov 79 pp 1, 5

[Interview with Yasir 'Arafat, PLO Chairman, by Ramzi Habia; "On Second Anniversary of al-Sadat Regime's Capitulation and on Eve of Tunis Summit, Yasir 'Arafat Gives Exclusive Interview to AL-SHA'B; Political Decision Required of Our Arab Nation; We Have Gone Beyond Phase of Steadfastness and Begun Phase of Successful Confrontation; Events of Past 2 Years Have Proven That We Have Gone Beyond Phase of Steadfastness and Begun Phase of Successful Confrontation; We Refuse to Have Tunis Summit Constitute a Step Backward; U.S. Sanctions Against Iran Push Area Toward War; At Meeting of Steadfastness Front in Algiers, We Formulated Common Plan to Confront Current Developments in Area; Alternative to Camp David Accords Is Continuation of Fighting"]

[Text] On the occasion of the second anniversary of al-Sadat's capitulationist visit to the occupied Jerusalem and on the eve of the convocation of the Arab summit in Tunis, Yasir 'Arafat, the PLO Executive Committee chairman, has granted AL-SHA'B exclusively a long interview in which he has dealt with the political and military position of the Palestinian issue and with the recent developments on the Arab arena.

'Arafat has answered AL-SHA'B questions concerning his evaluation of the steadfastness and confrontation procession after 2 years of the treasonous visit. He has also talked about the Tunis summit and what he expects of it as a summit "that must be advanced." He has also pointed out that the works of the latest conference of the Arab ministers of foreign affairs constituted a victory for the reality under which we live.

Yasir 'Arafat also touched on the situation in southern Lebanon, saying that the Zionist enemy uses southern Lebanon as an experimental field against our children and women and that we have no choice, as he says, but to fight against the enemy's barbaric attacks.

After citing the examples of the Algerian and Vietnamese revolutions in steadfastness, the Palestinian revolution leader analyzed the dimensions of the popular uprising currently sweeping the West Bank. He then defined the Palestinian revolution's position toward the Iranian revolution which is facing an economic war, in the full sense of the world, launched by the United States.

He finally said that the alternative to the Camp David accords is fighting and continuation of the fight, wondering how Carter can use the oil weapon and the weapon of freezing assets against Iran in 48 hours while we, the Arabs, are not entitled to use any of our weapons!

After his return from Moscow and in the midst of his preparations for the Arab summit, AL-SHA'B interviewed PLO Chairman Yasir 'Arafat in Beirut, the capital of Lebanon, and conducted with him a dialogue dealing with the West Bank and Gaza uprising and, the Palestinian revolution's position toward the ongoing confrontation between the Iranian revolution and the United States of America.

The Palestinian revolution commander answered AL-SHA'B questions with utter frankness, focusing the lights on the developments being currently undergone by the Middle East area.

Even though the interview that our correspondent in Beirut conducted had been designed to deal with the second anniversary of the ominous 19 November and to evaluate the steadfastness and confrontation procession organized to answer the trip of treason and shame made by al-Sadat to the occupied Jerusalem on this day in 1977, the fast-moving current developments that are connected in more than one way with the national reply to the plot, made it inevitable but to touch on these issues. Abu-'Ammar, the general commander of the Palestinian revolution, agreed, thankfully, to define to AL-SHA'B his positions toward these issues, declaring that the resistance has put its forces on the alert to participate in confronting any aggression to which the revolutionary Iran may be exposed. Abu-'Ammar has not ruled out the possibility that the imperialist-Zionist alliance may commit another folly in the area. He has also stressed that the Camp David musketeers have not been able to move a single step forward.

Abu-'Ammar has told AL-SHA'B that Algeria is prepared to take part in any liberation war and that, like the Palestinian revolution, Algeria makes its own decision. He also said that all the Arabs have to do is to respond to the Algerian and Palestinian revolutions so that we may initiate the victorious offensive and foil the plot against our Arab nation.

Following is the verbatim text of the interview conducted with brother Abu-'Ammar in one of the revolution's positions:

[Question] In the 2 years since the treasonous visit to Jerusalem, the Palestinian revolution has scored further political and military victories and the tripartite alliance [U.S.-Egyptian-Israeli] has reached a deadend. What is your evaluation of the steadfastness and confrontation march after these 2 years?

[Answer] There is no doubt that the resignations taking place in the Zionist entity currently indicate the dilemma faced by Camp David. The attention of whoever keeps up with the Egyptian information media is

arrested by the hysterical attack against the Steadfastness and Confrontation Front, against the leaders of the front, against the Baghdad summit, against the Baghdad summit resolutions and against the Arab ministers of foreign affairs and finance. These frenzied actions and this suspect campaign that is being launched by the Camp David parties against the Palestinian revolution and against the Palestinian revolution leadership in particular are the biggest indication of the dilemma and the deadend reached by the Camp David parties.

I want to ask, where is the "halo" that used to surround al-Sadat? Where is the hero of peace? The hero of peace watches the crushing war launched by the Zionist forces against the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples while shaking hands with Ezer Weizman, the Israeli minister of war, who has just come to Cairo from southern Lebanon or who is just about to return from Cairo to southern Lebanon to intensify his military operations against the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples! This is why I say that the events of the past 2 years have proven that we have gone beyond the phase of steadfastness and have begun the phase of successful confrontation. We have besieged the Camp David parties. What is occurring in the occupied territories provides the proof that the Camp David musketeers are incapable of moving a single step forward in the self-rule plot and that they are at the threshold of a new defeat.

[Question] Do you expect the Tunis summit to constitute an advanced step on the confrontation path and to surpass the minimum-limit resolutions of the Baghdad summit?

[Answer] The Tunis summit must be advanced. It must be advanced. This is what we agreed upon with my brothers the Arab heads of state at the Algiers conference when the leaders of the Steadfastness and Confrontation Front countries met during the 25th anniversary of the inception of the Algerian revolution. We have also agreed with the Iraqi brothers in the wake of the meeting with brother President Saddam Husayn. This means that we refuse to have the Tunis summit constitute a step backward, if not a step forward at least. We accept no retreat.

[Question] Doesn't approval of the Arab summit agenda as agreed upon by the Arab ministers of foreign affairs constitute a victory for the steadfastness and confrontation position?

[Answer] I will not say that it constitutes a victory for anybody but I will say that it constitutes a victory for the reality under which we live. Our Arab nation is facing a plot. All that is happening in southern Lebanon, in northwest Africa, in the northern front and inside the occupied territories is nothing but the ramifications of the Camp David plot. We expected this as of the moment in which al-Sadat went to Jerusalem and as of the moment in which the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty--the treaty of capitulation and of humiliation and shame--was signed.

[Question] How does the Palestinian resistance view the possibilities of a solution in southern Lebanon and how does it view the situation there?

[Answer] As I have already said, the solution in southern Lebanon lies primarily in the political decision which will be issued by the Arab summit on whether we are to stand fast or not and whether we are to be or not to be. The Zionist ambitions in southern Lebanon are obvious. The Zionist plan is "moving forth" and is well-known and it has already been implemented in the Golan, in the West Bank and in Gaza Strip. Confronting the Zionist plan is a must. What is required is a political decision. I ask: Does the Arab nation want to have a truce with the Zionist plan? No. We in the Palestinian revolution have taken the decision to confront "and urge the believers to fight." It can only cost life. By God, if my rifle were the only one, I would still fight. We have a just cause. We are the victims of an aggression. It is the right of all states whose lands are occupied and all states which are attacked to fight in defense of their lands, of their honor, their dignity and their future. This is the Palestinian revolution's decision and the decision of all the free and honorable men in the Arab homeland. We must consider this a fundamental point in confronting the bitter reality under which the Lebanese and Palestinian masses are living. This is the responsibility of the Arab summit which must provide these masses with protection, care, refuge and compensations. What is important is the decision. What is required of our Arab nation is the political decision.

The Palestinian revolution's decision is to continue the confrontation and the steadfastness--this mythical steadfastness that have gone on for 7 months under the hell in which we have been living in Lebanon. What has happened? They have used the latest U.S. weapons--the F-15's and F-16's. Even the F-18's which they have not yet used do not intimidate us. Let them use them and let them use with them even F-80's. They are welcome.

Did the Vietnamese succumb? We will not succumb. The Vietnamese did not succumb and, therefore, we will not succumb. The Algerians did not succumb and, therefore, we will not succumb. Our nation has enormous resources and the Palestinian revolution is on the threshold of the 16th year of its life. It is the longest Arab revolution and it is still steadfast everywhere. It is steadfast in the occupied Jordan [sic]. There are 11,000 policemen, beside the Zionist army, to confront the escalating operations of the Palestinian revolutionaries in the occupied territories.

The Zionist enemy is using Lebanon as an experimental field against children and women and is testing the U.S. weapons there. We have no choice but to fight against his barbaric attacks.

[Question] Where does the brother general commander of the Palestinian revolution place the event that is preoccupying the world at present, namely the uprising of the occupied territories, and what are its dimensions in the confrontation battle against the Camp David plot and its tripartite alliance, especially under the present circumstances?

[Answer] First, we must examine what is happening in the occupied territories, considering that they are one of the fundamental fronts on which we are fighting against the Camp David plot. At the same time, it is one of the fronts in which the Carter-Begin-al-Sadat trio has launched its counter-attack in retaliation for the steadfastness and confrontation resolutions which were followed by the Baghdad summit after which came the conference of the Arab ministers of foreign affairs and finance to implement the resolutions agreed upon.

This counter-attack has been focused on our people in the occupied territories and has taken the form of a number of serious, fascist and oppressive measures, such as the confiscation of land, the construction of settlements, terrorization of the population through deportation and detention and the adoption of collective punitive measures against towns and villages--measures which have reached the point of seizing the sources of water. As a result, our people in the occupied territories have produced this magnificent reply which is currently crowned by the splendid popular uprising against the Zionist authorities' decisions to deport one of our leaders and of the leaders of our people in the occupied territories, namely brother Bassam al-Shak'ah, the mayor of Nabulus.

The other side of the battle is the intensifying military war of attrition against our Lebanese and Palestinian peoples--a war in which the latest weapons, even those banned internationally, are used, causing the destruction of numerous Lebanese towns and villages and of Palestinian camps and the eviction of hundreds of thousands of Lebanese and Palestinians. The fact is that this infernal terrorist war is still going on and that the Zionist enemy leaders are still implementing it.

But this will not intimidate us and will not cause us to hesitate in retaliating against the enemy, whether in the occupied territories or in southern Lebanon, with all the means of military and political struggle. We have all become experienced in this struggle and we, and all the Arabs with us, will not retreat. Our steadfastness has proven that the Arab nation does not lack the resolution and the steadfastness.

[Question] The current battle between the Iranian revolution and the United States of America seems to be open to all possibilities. After the talk about a Palestinian mediation came the Palestinian statement warning the United States of the consequences of aggression and declaring that the Palestinian revolution stands with the Iranian revolution in the same trench. How do you view the steps of this confrontation?

[Answer] First, we have not and will not exert mediation efforts with the Iranian revolution concerning the hostages detained in the U.S. embassy. We and the Iranian revolution are in one trench. However, we did move at the outset and made swift contacts with our Iranian brothers on the basis of the principle that this country is a friend of the [Palestinian] revolution. We moved accordingly and Brig Gen Sa'd Sayil, alias Abu-al-Walid, the chief of the operations room, was sent to Iran to explore the

situation. In the wake of the developments that have taken place, beginning with the stopped importation of Iranian oil and the freezing of the Iranian assets in U.S. banks by the United States, and after U.S., British and Australian military moves to display their military muscle in preparation for committing some foolish acts, we are now viewing the situation from a different angle. The decision to freeze the Iranian assets in U.S. banks is a serious and unparalleled precedence in the world. This means that they are pushing the area toward the brink of war, especially since this happened at a time when brother Bani Sadr (the present minister of foreign affairs) declared the readiness of the Iranian officials to release some detainees. The U.S. decision to stop the importation of oil was taken at this time. I see real danger in the freezing of assets and in the U.S. military movement and it is no speculation to say that it is "a declaration of war." We are observing the movement that accompanies the U.S. intensification and we are analyzing the bases on which the parallel Zionist movement will take place and in what direction this movement will proceed. Therefore, we are studying the reply to this movement. I have given an order that our forces be put on the alert so that they may be ready to support the Iranian revolution or to answer any attack that the Zionist enemy may be thinking of launching against our people in southern Lebanon.

I am warning that the clouds of war are now gathering in the area. The United States and its ally, the Zionist entity, are responsible for any folly committed by either of these two allies and to which the other [al-Sadat] ally may be dragged.

[Question] Some people consider the escalated U.S. confrontation against the Iranian revolution, the ban on the importation of oil and the freezing of the assets as tantamount to an advance warning to the Arab summit, especially to those who think of using the weapon of oil and of Arab assets. What is the Palestinian revolution's answer to such a warning?

[Answer] Historical stances are not measured by the yardstick of loss and profit. Consequently, I disagree with any person in our Arab nation who measures matters with this yardstick. "O you believers, you have been destined to fight and you may hate something that is good for you." [Loose translation of Koran quotation]

As for the warning, especially to the Palestinian revolution, I say that the Palestinian revolution threatens and is not threatened and warns and is not warned. The Palestinian revolution has repeatedly declared its opinion on this issue with utter clarity.

[Question] Your latest visit to the Soviet Union on the eve of the Arab summit and of the U.S.-Iranian confrontation battle has been placed within the framework of organizing the confrontation and giving it an international dimension. What is your opinion of this interpretation?

[Answer] There is no doubt that my visit to the Soviet Union has been successful and it will certainly be reflected on the situation. I prefer to let the events talk.

[Question] Does the visit have any connection with the steadfastness and confrontation conference held in Algiers recently?

[Answer] The most important aspect of the Algiers conference is that we formulated in it a common plan to confront all the current developments in the area, including coordination during the forthcoming Tunis conference.

[Question] Some people wonder about the alternative program to the Camp David accords. What does the Palestinian revolution say?

[Answer] The Palestinian revolution has offered the alternative. The alternative is military escalation. The alternative is this large-scale diplomatic movement. The revolution has projected the alternative with this vast political activity, even inside the United States itself.

Let me ask: What was the alternative before France in World War II? There was (Beitan) and there was de Gaulle. (Beitan) called for surrender to Nazism. De Gaulle said no we will not surrender and he triumphed.

The alternative is to continue fighting and is in continued fighting. The alternative is in steadfastness. The alternative is in confrontation. There will come the day when our Arab nation will be able to regain its territories. It has been proven throughout history that the victory of oppression does not last. We notice that throughout history, the forces of oppression were not able to stand fast. The French stayed in Algeria for 130 years and used to say that Algeria was French. Where is France now insofar as Algeria is concerned?

We celebrated at the beginning of this month the 25th anniversary of the inception of the victorious Algerian revolution and we saw the weapons that are ready to take part with us when we adopt the decision for the comprehensive confrontation. We saw the Mig-25's, the SAM-9's and the 72 tank, in addition to the latest weapons. I am certain that the Algerian revolution is ready to take part in the liberation war when it flares up. I repeat that what is important is to adopt the decision, the steadfastness decision.

The decision is that of steadfastness at present. The Palestinian revolution has been able to move from the steadfastness decision to implementing the decision of political, military, diplomatic and popular confrontation at more than one front. The Arab nation is required to move and to get prepared to use its weapons.

Within 48 hours, Carter used the oil weapon and weapon of freezing assets. Aren't we entitled to use any of our weapons? It is as the poet has said:

Forbidden to its nightingales is the branch; but permitted to birds of all other kinds.

Are we forbidden to use our weapons whereas the United States is permitted to use its weapons against Iran and to exploit its economic weapons against Cuba and China while we hesitate to use one single weapon of ours?

INTER-ARAB AFFAIRS

SALAH KHALAF DISCUSSES LEBANESE PROBLEM, SAYS PALESTINIAN STATE IMMINENT

Beirut AL-ANWAR in Arabic 2 Nov 79 pp 4-5, 11

[Interview with Salah Khalaf by Fu'ad Da'bul and George Tarabulsi: "Text of Abu-Iyad's Interview With AL-ANWAR: I Call on Lebanese Front for Dialogue and for Frank Discussion; Resistance Will Not Again 'Take Picnic' in Lebanon's Quick Sands; Our Cause Is Strengthened With Support of Amin al-Jumayyil and Danny Sham'un; Our Operations in South Are Suspended and Will Remain So; Lebanese Crisis will be Solved in Seconds if All Parties Sever Their Relations With Outside World; Palestinian State Closer Than Observers Think"]

[Text] Salah Khalaf (Abu-Iyad) has stated in an exclusive interview with AL-ANWAR that he does not expect new battles in Lebanon and that the Palestinian resistance will not again waste its time on a picnic in Lebanon's quick sands.

He called on the Lebanese Front for a meeting of frank discussion to put all matters in the open and to eliminate fear from the hearts. He said that if every faction severs its relations with the outside circles, be they Arab or international, then the Lebanese crisis would be solved within seconds.

Abu-Iyad lauded Amin al-Jumayyil's and Danny Sham'un's recent statements in the United States. He also lauded Bashir al-Jumayyil's position toward the United States. He said: When Amin al-Jumayyil and Danny Sham'un are on my side, my cause is strengthened domestically and externally.

He said that the solution in Lebanon is achieved by way of unanimous Lebanese detente with the Palestinians, through legitimacy, and in the presence and under the patronage of the State of Syria.

He also said: The Lebanese Front is not the only one responsible for sabotaging the solution. There are numerous sides sabotaging it. There are kingdoms and more kingdoms and there is a national unity between the crooks. There is unity between the two [eastern and western] areas and they steal cars in the eastern areas and sell them in the western and vice versa.

Abu-Iyad said that he supports absolutely the army's entry to the south and that if Lebanon's Arab Army commits whatever may harm the army, "we will fight it."

He further said: Our operations in the south are suspended and will remain suspended. He added: We support any measure that has been taken or will be taken in the future to abolish the armed manifestations.

Abu-Iyad declared: The Palestinian state will be realized in a shorter time than most observers expect. I do not want to divulge a secret but what I want to say is that all the contacts that are taking place are bringing closer the close, and very close, zero hour.

Following is the text of the interview:

[Question] The key to an interview with Abu-Iyad is this traditional question: Where does the path to Palestine pass through?

[Answer] (Laughingly) Strange. I have explained this point more than once.

[Question] We would like to hear it [explanation] from you once more.

[Answer] I am not evading an answer to this question. On the contrary, there are many things that are more important to talk about. I am telling this story for the tenth time. However, there is no harm in repeating it to AL-ANWAR. I was making a speech on the occasion of the martyrdom of two Lebanese in the area of 'Aynturah. A woman came weeping and bemoaning to the podium and said: Wouldn't it have been better for them to have been martyred for Palestine? I was deeply touched and walked down from the podium to her to try to comfort her. While talking with her, one of those present interrupted and said loudly something to the effect that the path to Palestine passes through Junyah, 'Aynturah, etc. It so happened that a journalist was present and reported the statement, attributing it to me. The Phalanges radio got enraged and launched a scathing attack against me. The truth is that I did not wish to answer those attacks at the time because of the special circumstances under which the country was living. However, I did explain the matter properly when the storm had subsided. Believe me I did not make that statement and also believe me that I am not one to make such statements.

Reorganizing Relations

[Question] Brother Abu-Iyad, the fact is that you are now in charge of reorganizing the Lebanese-Palestinian relations and that you are exerting thankful efforts in this regard. Where have these efforts of yours reached so far?

[Answer] The fact is that I am not exerting these efforts on a personal basis but on assignment by the other brothers.

I believe that the meeting that has taken place between brother Abu-'Ammar and President Sarkis (and before him with Prime Minister al-Huss) constituted a positive and very important phase, especially at a time when the issue of Lebanon and of its southern part and our issue in particular are passing through a very serious stage in which only serious and positive statements are permissible. This meeting crowned a series of meetings held with several sides and all those meetings were positive. Their outcome is not tangible yet. However, the good results of the meetings will show shortly.

Listen carefully to what I am going to say. One side, even two sides together, cannot play a positive role in isolation from the other sides. It is not enough for the government to be positive and it is not enough for the resistance to be positive. Positivity must be the slogan of all the parties concerned and all concerned should sit around the negotiations table and solve all the problems.

Here, we must not forget Syria's role, regardless of the opinion of some sides in the Arab Deterrence Forces, because Syria has its influential role on the Lebanese stage, like it or not. Disregarding Syria's role in any political solution is in itself a disregarding of reason and of logic.

Therefore, I say that an understanding must be reached with the legitimate Lebanese government and this government must be made to represent all so that when an understanding is reached between the government and the resistance, this understanding will be reflected on all concerned. The legitimate government [al-shar'iyah] is the first and the last authority and it is the big river into which all the other tributaries must flow and in which they must place their trust, beginning with the National Movement and National Front and ending with the Lebanese Front, because the solution will come with and through the government. There is no alternative to the government, not now and not in the future. Lebanon's salvation will come through understanding and without an understanding there will be no solution, regardless of what moves the parties concerned made and regardless of how sincere they are in their moves.

[Question] You are talking about the solution, frankly? Is there one problem or are there several problems on the Lebanese stage. What is the link between them [problems] and where is the starting point?

[Answer] Fragmenting the problems in Lebanon is a very faulty thing. However, it can be said that there are hotter problems than others and there are problems that can be postponed and others that cannot.

The hot problem presently is the south. But the other problems are no less hot than it is. The north is a problem. What is happening in the eastern area is a problem and what is happening in the western area is also a problem. The legitimate government's control over all the Lebanese territories is a problem and detente is a problem. All these are problems and if you wanted

to arrange them on the basis of priority, you would not be able to. The solution, in my opinion, will not come except by way of a Lebanese detente-- as I have always stated without ever changing my opinion--and then through unanimous Lebanese detente, through the legitimate government, with the Palestinians, in the presence and under the patronage of the State of Syria.

These are general statements. If you want details, then I can assure you that several hands are tampering with the south and pouring oil on its raging fire. I will give you an example of this fact in the interview with Sa'd Haddad published by one of the newspapers. Is the aim of this interview to sabotage the solution or just to get it ready? If the aim of the interview is to have the army enter the south on agreement with Sa'd Haddad, then it would have been better not to have published the interview and to have taken the feelings of the others in this regard into consideration.

National Movement's Role

[Question] Sorry for interrupting you but it is said that Sa'd Haddad has embarrassed you and has exposed some of the practices to which you resort vis-a-vis the government. For example, when agreement was reached between you and the legitimate government on the army's entry to the south [words missing] to decide the agreement by throwing the ball in the National Movement's court. Then Sa'd Haddad came and threw the ball in your court anew, thus exposing the unclear intentions in the dealings between the Palestinian revolution and the Lebanese legitimate government. What is your reply?

[Answer] The fact is that a part of what you have said is somewhat true. But on the other hand, I cannot disregard the National Movement which has its weight on the Lebanese stage.

Let us speak more frankly. When the Syrian forces, and then the Saudi forces, were evacuated from Burj Rizq, the legitimate government was compelled to negotiate with Bashir al-Jumayyil and Danny Sham'un for days to gain their approval for the army's entry to the said area. This is a reality in Lebanon created not by Abu-Iyad but by the circumstances, by the Lebanese structure and by the equations agreed upon throughout long generations.

The following question occurs to my mind here: If the Lebanese army were stronger and if the Phalanges and Liberal parties did not have their effective presence in the eastern area, would the Lebanese army command take the trouble or condescend to negotiate with this or that, as it has done with Bashir and Danny? I don't think so. But when a man is powerless he finds himself compelled to enter these areas through understanding and dialogue, exactly as has happened between the Lebanese army and the leaders of the Lebanese forces.

In the south, and regardless of the weight of the other forces, the National Movement has its presence, its intrinsic strength and its strong entity. Suppose here that I approve the army's entry to the south and the National Movement opposes it, what would happen? The answer is very simple, namely that this movement, in cooperation with Lebanon's Arab Army, can fully prevent the army from entering, exactly like when Sa'd Haddad and his group opposed the army's entry. Isn't it so?

Kingdoms and Kingdoms

[Question] They will prevent the army if you want this to happen.

[Answer] It is not so. I approve frankness, provided that you accept my frankness also.

Until now, I have not heard a single sweet word from the other side so that I may feel comfortable and may establish a balance in my relations with this side. Listen to Bashir's or Danny's statements, or even to the statement made by the Lebanese Front after our agreement with the government. They are statements full of defamation. This is shameful and it is a sabotaging of the solution, in my opinion.

Don't take my words to mean that the Lebanese Front is solely responsible for sabotaging the solution. Not at all. There are numerous sides sabotaging it. There are kingdoms and kingdoms and every one who has his kingdom is happy with it. Let this age of kingdoms end. Let the real Lebanon live. Abdicate to the legitimate government and let it live.

As for us as Palestinians, I assure you that we do not wish to support one faction at the expense of another because we need to have all the sides satisfied. This is why I say that what has delayed the speedy entry of the army so far is the violent statement issued by the Lebanese Front and then by the opinion of the National Movement which has its presence in the south. Add to this the interview given by Sa'd Haddad.

Finally, and regardless of the position of all the well-known and the secret columns that want to sabotage the solution, quote me as stating that we support the entry of the Lebanese army in the manner that the government deems fit, but on the basis of comprehensive agreement among all the sides because separate and offhanded solutions usually lead to failure most of the time.

[Question] The legitimate government has projected a specific visualization or a specific working paper for the expected Arab summit and this visualization or paper is close to your personal projections. Prime Minister al-Huss has said that Lebanon cannot go to the summit without a Lebanese-Palestinian detente supported by Syria.

We notice that this thing [visualization] which is close to yours is faltering. What we mean is that the [army's] entry to the south will establish the government's authority at the expense of the kingdoms present there. As long as you are in agreement in your projections, as is evident from your statements and meetings and from Prime Minister al-Huss's statements and utterances, then why do you let the other marginal obstacles obstruct the realization of your joint goals?

[Answer] I would like in my turn, to ask you this question in view of the fact that you work in the press and keep up with the news: Do these words [of yours] apply to the eastern area? Can the army enter a single building in the said area without the approval of the Phalanges or the Liberals? You cannot ask me, brother, to be more royalist than the king. I am telling you for the tenth time that the National Movement and the National Front have their presence that nobody can deny, not me, not you and not anybody. Never understand my words to mean that the National Movement is intransigent and opposes the solution. Not at all. The movement projects the issue within the framework of a comprehensive solution for the entire Lebanese issue. This is the movement's opinion and this is its position and I have nothing to do with the matter.

This is what I have explained to Prime Minister al-Huss in my meeting with him.

[Question] What was the government's reply?

[Answer] This question would be better addressed to Prime Minister al-Huss personally.

National Movement Isn't in Our Pocket

[Question] The prevalent view is that the resistance made recently international political and informational gains equal to what it will lose as a result of the army's entry to the south which will have the area of the resistance's military influence reduced. It seems that the government and the resistance do not see eye to eye in this regard. What is your opinion.

[Answer] The situation is not exactly as you have pointed out. But I excuse you because the error you have fallen into is the same as that into which more than one side on the Lebanese stage has fallen.

Everybody thinks that the National Movement is in our pocket. This is wrong. It is true that we influence the movement and it influences us. But this influence is not to the degree that you or those better-informed than you imagine.

Let me give you as an example of this fact the day in which the Palestinians met with Sham'un and al-Jumayyil. Didn't the National Movement get enraged at us? And did it leave a single word that it did not say against us? Is this true or not? What do you want me to do? Do you want me to carry the sword and kill them because they made statements against this meeting?

To answer your question, the positions of the resistance and those of the National Movement should not be linked because each of them has its independent presence. Even though there is cooperation between us at the level of certain matters, everything has its limits ultimately.

[Question] Don't you think that the resistance's weight tips the scales in its favor?

[Answer] These words are correct only in one case, namely when the legitimate government is in control of all of Lebanon with the exception of the area in which we are present.

But the fact is, frankly, contrary to this because there are numerous areas over which the legitimate government has no control--areas whose dossier nobody is opening.

Allow me to ask you this question: Why hasn't the army entered the north? You may tell me that ex-President Sulayman Franjiyah has a special viewpoint in this regard. Great, but why isn't this issue raised in the same manner in which the issue of the south is raised in our face or in the face of the National Movement?

[Question] Ex-President Franjiyah's view is that the army is present in the north now and that there is no need to bring more forces from other areas because the elements that are currently there are enough.

[Answer] I don't know to what degree what you say agrees with the reality. All that I know is that ex-President Franjiyah opposes the army's entry to the north.

In any case I have brought up this issue to demonstrate to you the lack of balance in the legitimate government's relations with the parties concerned on the Lebanese stage.

Brother, don't ask me to sell all the people at a time when the other side gives me no facilities and not even a spark of hope.

We want to make matters easier than you think. I can assure you of this. As a proof of the truth of my word and of my good intentions, listen to this story: In the recent incidents in the north, five Palestinians were detained. Nobody knows this because we have not published a statement in this regard.

I understand that there is disagreement between Sulayman Franjiyah and the Phalanges or between him and Samir Ja'ja' and his group. But what do we have to do with this issue? What has our reaction been? We have not published a statement on the five detained people, why? Because we do not wish to embark on pitfalls of this kind and we do not even wish to pour oil on the fire. On the contrary, we wish to extinguish the fire with utter sincerity and seriousness.

Is it true that five people were detained in Nahr al-Barid Camp as a spontaneous reaction to the incident [of five detained Palestinians]. But what did we do? Believe me we sent a delegation immediately--by land--and supplied him with a special message for the release of the detainees and with an order from the command stating that everybody is totally forbidden from getting involved in the sectarian game because it does not serve the Palestinian cause but rather obstructs it and diverts it from its correct line and its real goals.

Why don't you look for the roots?

When will we see all the Lebanese concerned seated around one table, talking and solving their problems with pure hearts and with absolute faith?

Believe me that we will gain more at such a time. Why? Because when I have Amin al-Jumayyil, George Hawi, Danny Sham'un and others on my side, my cause is further strengthened internally, externally and in the Palestinian state.

Brother, it is time for us to get rid of you and for you to get rid of us. It is time to break this partnership. Isn't it?

[Question] Brother Abu-Iyad, you have asked for frankness in the discussion, haven't you?

[Answer] Yes, and I insist on frankness.

Self-Criticism

[Question] Whatever form and manner the dialogue between the Lebanese Front and the government takes, it is still a dialogue between Lebanese in their homeland, Lebanon, whereas the dialogue between the government and the National Movement is different in view of the influence of aliens, yourselves included, on this movement. This is why the Lebanese Front expects concessions, when there is talk about concessions, from you first. What is your opinion?

[Answer] Let me ask you in my turn: Isn't the National Movement a Lebanese movement? Isn't George Hawi Lebanese and does he not have the Lebanese identity card? Isn't the Communist Party a Lebanese party licensed by the government for over 50 years?

Ibrahim Qulaylat is Lebanese. Muhsin Ibrahim is Lebanese and In'am Ra'd is Lebanese. True or not? And others also. All that is there to the matter is that their presence has happened to be in the area in which we are present. Therefore, you cannot deny their identity or their presence and you cannot turn a blind eye to their armed military presence. I invite you to the south to see and ascertain the soundness of my words for yourself.

Let me, moreover, talk to you from a purely opportunistic position and a purely opportunistic stance. Why do you want me to sell the National Movement at a time when the other side demands that I be disarmed, be distributed like sheep among the Arab countries and be expelled from Lebanon? They say all this whereas I hear words of support and welcome from the National Movement. Should I meet all this with ingratitude? No, by God. Our honor prevents us from doing such a thing.

Unity of Crooks

[Question] At the outset of the two-year war, the resistance declared that the plot was aimed against it and against its entity and presence. Yet, the resistance did get involved in the fighting. Now that the storm has subsided, will the resistance engage in self-criticism so as to formulate a comprehensive solution for the Lebanese issue, or what?

[Answer] Self-criticism should not be embarked upon by the resistance alone but by all the sides because all the sides got as deeply immersed as we did. We were only defending ourselves. I did not come to Lebanon of my own free will but as a result of an ignoble aggression against my country.

It is true that I do not accept to have Lebanon slaughtered for my cause, and it would be selfish on my part to accept such a thing, but it is also unreasonable for me to be idealistic to the degree whereby I let myself be slaughtered for Lebanon. What is required is a balance and what is required is to give the right to those entitled to it, justly and fairly.

So if a Lebanese, be he on this or that side, does not feel love for Lebanon, am I required to be more sentimental than he is?

I am not talking about the opportunists, whom I attack constantly, and I am not talking about the [war] merchants and those who collect protection money. I have said in a previous statement that there is national unity in Lebanon between the crooks and the thieves. Believe me there is unity between the two areas. They steal a car from the eastern area and sell in the western area and vice versa. A bank is robbed in the western area and the robbers go to the eastern area and vice versa. Add to this all the violations in the areas of al-Biq'a', Ba'labakk and others.

There is a long and widespread joint-stock network which has its political detente in Lebanon.

So don't ask me to engage in self-criticism alone and don't ask me exclusively to liquidate my presence and my cause. Ask me to make things easier and to cooperate with the government and I am ready to implement the request immediately.

The issue of the army's entry to the south does not affect my cause or my presence. In any case, it is not my right as a Palestinian to say no to the army's entry, even if this army itself does not want to enter.

You are unaware that the army has entered the south twice and that its vehicles come and go without being harassed by anybody. When the army entered Kawkaba in western al-Biqa', who assisted its entry, who facilitated its task and who prevented it from advancing and who shelled it? This is something that everybody should know, isn't it so?

[Question] Perhaps this happened because it was the vanguards army.

[Answer] No, not at all. The army entered on the orders of the command. The army's composition is not important. What is important is that it entered on the orders of Brig Gen Victor Khuri, the army commander, to take positions in the border strip area.

This army could not advance because of the shelling by Haddad's forces so it entered the areas that were under the control of the resistance. The resistance withdrew and handed its positions over to this army.

When later on Prime Minister al-Huss demanded officially in the name of the government that another battalion enter--this battalion entered the area by way of the zone under the control of the U.N. forces--it was suggested that the battalion be taken there by helicopters. We were the ones who turned down this suggestion. We said it is a disgrace to our honor to let the army resort to these means in order to move in its own country. We insisted that the army enter in the manner that it deems proper and that preserves its dignity and honor.

Now I ask you to go to the south to see how the army vehicles move with utter freedom and without being impeded by any obstacles, not even obstacles created by Lebanon's Arab Army.

In any case, not even Lebanon's Arab Army will commit any act to undermine the Lebanese army. Should Lebanon's Arab Army do so, we will fight it.

In Sidon, there is an army barracks that has been completely turned over to the army. The same goes for Tyre where we told the command a long time ago to come and take it over. So practically, the army is in the south.

One time they suggested to us that they move a battalion consisting of 200 troops from the zone of the U.N. forces operations to take over the Tyre barracks. We told them: No, leave these troops where they are and bring us others from another area. We said this because we have no problem in this regard. The truth is that those who imagine that we are against the army are wrong. We are for the army and for facilitating its mission.

I want to tell you something, and let them deny it [if they can]. After the battalion (consisting of 500 troops) had entered the south, Prime Minister al-Huss wanted to add to it 56 more elements so that its sectarian structure may comply with the Lebanese equation (6 and 6 repeated). When this was done, Israel made contacts through the U.N. forces and demanded that the additional elements be withdrawn immediately. Do you know why? Because in accordance with the truce agreement, the Lebanese army is not permitted to deploy more than 1,500 elements [along the borders]. Now there are more than 1,000 troops among us and we wish that they would be raised by 500 or 1,000 more because we support them in every decision they make. But what is required is a political solution. The problem is not one of deploying or not deploying the army but of linking this issue with a comprehensive solution to the Lebanese issue in its entirety. This is at least what we have understood from the Syrians and from the leaders of the National Movement and of the National Front.

Cairo Agreement

[Question] Is the Cairo agreement still extant?

[Answer] The problem is not one of provisions but one of souls. Our problem is that as long as no alternative is found, the Cairo agreement will continue to exist.

[Question] Now only one equation exists: To save the south or to save the Cairo agreement? Should we let the south be lost so that we may not amend, change or reduce this agreement?

[Answer] I don't know. In any case, this issue is not in the picture now so why are you bringing it up?

[Question] Prime Minister al-Huss has been clear in an interview he gave to a local newspaper that the Cairo agreement is still extant but that the time is not right for discussing it because this is the time for saving the south. What is your opinion?

[Answer] To start with, I have not been speaking to you about the Cairo agreement but have been trying to explain to you the viewpoint of the National Movement which insists that there is an agreement between the resistance and the Lebanese government that gives the resistance the right to move freely. If the army enters the south and sets up its roadblocks, will the freedom of movement still be given to all these factions or what? This is the question asked by the National Movement, the National Front and the rest of the brothers.

Insofar as we are concerned, our viewpoint is special and different. We have four or five camps in the south and the question is: Can the army, with its present capabilities, secure the necessary protection for these

camps against any brutal raids by the Zionist enemy? Of course not. In any case, this is not required on the army because we may not ask the Lebanese army to do what the Egyptian or Jordanian army, or even the Syrian and Iraqi armies, cannot do.

Lebanon's issue is well-known. It is also well-known that Lebanon needs a political solution and needs detente. I will tell you here that regardless of the National Movement's viewpoint, we support any flexibility that leads to saving the south, to keeping any form of occupation away from it and to sparing it the repeated blows that cause the people there to suffer. I again assure you that we support any step beneficial to the south.

[Question] Last week Fatah issued a statement saying that it does not agree to have the south saved at the expense of the revolution. What is your opinion?

[Answer] It is not exactly so. In any case, I have already told you that I do not agree to have Lebanon slaughtered for my sake and that, likewise, I do not agree to be slaughtered for the sake of Lebanon. This is the equation.

Let Them Take Tyre Barracks

[Question] How can we harmonize this equation with the loss of the south [sic]?

[Answer] Do not fear, the south will not be lost. All this is nonsense. But if you mean that the problem is that of the army's entry, then you are wrong because we are not against the army's entry. Moreover, we are committed to the utmost degree not to embroil the south in any new problems. The issue is bigger than this. I have declared repeatedly that we have stopped our operations from the south. We have also undertaken not to announce military statements from Lebanon. We are also committed not to shell and strike [from the south]. We have not and will not say no to the army's entry to al-Biqa', the south, the north or any other area.

The Tyre barracks is there. Let them come and take it, and you may quote me. This is an undisputable issue. But the question remains: Are all these actions meant to save the south or to impose policies and solutions that we reject?

[Question] Will the Palestinian revolution agree to freeze its military activity, or to reduce it at least, in the present phase?

[Answer] What I would like to say, and say it publicly, is that our operations from the south have been suspended and will continue to be suspended. As to the question of reducing the military presence in the camps, this issue is connected with the right to self-defense until better circumstances are made available to us.

[Question] Brother Abu-Iyad you talk about protecting the camps and you yourselves are the ones who have brought the bear to the vineyard.

[Answer] How is that?

[Question] The Cairo agreement cancelled [asqatat] the truce agreement concluded with Israel and provided the opportunity for the latter to carry out military acts and acts of aggression against the south, aimed at the camps and other parts.

This means, in other words, that you gave the Zionist enemy the opportunity to enter the Lebanese territories at any hour and any time. What is your opinion?

[Answer] Let us put the picture in a different frame and ask: Do you want us to prevent our people in the occupied territories from carrying out military acts against Israel so that they may spare Lebanon?

The Cairo agreement permits us to open fire from the Lebanese territories. Yet, we do not do this so as not to expose Lebanon or its southern part to any danger.

The issue, brother, is not of agreements. The issue is one of aggressive intentions harbored by Israel for Lebanon. This makes us ask: Why don't they strike our camps in Jordan which are 10 times more than the camps in Lebanon? Why don't they strike our camps in Syria? Why? Why do they strike the south alone?

[Question] You have put us in a whirlwind of questions. What is the answer?

[Answer] This is a political issue. They conceal their aggressive intentions toward Lebanon behind the screen of striking the Palestinian camps existing in it.

Their ambitions in the south are historical. Moreover, by striking the south, they sow discord and conflict among the sons of the same line.

The custom was for them to retaliate for any operation we carried out with a similar and more violent operation, but lasting one day only. But this time, they have been striking for 7 successive months with the aim of creating a rebellion against the revolution and with the aim of sowing discord and conflict between the southern citizen and the Palestinian people living in the south, especially since the Arabs have offered and southern citizen nothing.

Imagine a person whose children are killed, his house destroyed and his blood shed and who does not find a drop of oil to compensate him for his loss. In my opinion, all this is a part of a plot aimed ultimately at involving Lebanon in the Camp David negotiations.

I say that Camp David is against Lebanon. But which Lebanon? The Lebanon of the Lebanese Front.

[Question] Do you mean to say because of the resettlement plan?

[Answer] Yes. Resettlement is one of the provisions of the Camp David accord. To be specific, it is one of the provisions of the accord's supplement concerning self-rule which stipulates that no Palestinian shall return to Palestine beyond the Palestinians already there.

This means that I will continue to sit on your chest, Lebanon, until Israel permits 10 or 20 persons from Lebanon and 10 or 20 more from Syria to return to the West Bank.

Self-rule means that 400,000 Palestinians will remain in Lebanon and 300,000 Palestinians will remain in Syria [and will become] Syrian citizens and Lebanese citizens and so forth in the rest of the Arab countries.

This is why all the resettlement enemies are our friends and why they should fight and self-rule plan and the Camp David accords in particular because they are against their interest as they are against ours.

Why Heavy Weapons?

[Question] As long as you are not using the south as a base for launching your operations against Israel, what is the reason that makes you keep the heavy weapons that you have in the camps present there?

[Answer] Simply, the justification is that any occupation of or strike against and seizure of the positions of the U.N. forces will mean ending the revolution or dealing it a back-breaking blow.

What I want to say is that the alternative for defending the camps has not been secured yet and, therefore, I am forced to carry the weapons in anticipation of any Israeli raid. As you know, the aim of the Israeli attacks is to involve us in a new Camp David. You remember that a U.S. plan was once made public in the form of an announcement [i'lan], later denied, talking about a Lebanese-Palestinian-Jordanian-Syrian meeting, in addition to direct Israeli dialogue with the PLO. This plan was folded and then re-announced.

[Question] Wasn't this plan projected during the two-year war?

[Answer] Yes. But it was then projected another time, calling for pressure to be exerted on the PLO to enter the Camp David equation (to discuss the self-rule issue).

Believe me, upon my honor, that self-rule means resettlement and means the continued presence of the Palestinians in Lebanon in spite of the Lebanese. It also means that, according to this plan, our people in Lebanon will become Lebanese, in Syria will become Syrians, in Jordan will become Jordanians and so forth. This means that they will divide us among the various Arab countries to take up their citizenship and merge in their societies.

From this you can understand why we insist on the creation of a Palestinian state over any inch of the Palestinian soil. From this also you can also understand why we insist on the support and friendship of all the Lebanese.

Look at Amin al-Jumayyil. I have heard his speech in the United States in which he spoke about the Palestinian people and about their right to self-determination. These are words over which the heart rejoices and which should be spoken by every Lebanese because through them comes the only solution to the issue. I want to ask you: When I have a homeland and a flag, what would I need a forged passport for, as I said this in comment on the case of Muhammad al-Yusuf who was arrested in Europe because of his forged passport?

What can I do when there is nobody to take care of my affairs? I am, therefore, compelled to produce forged passports. Here is where it can be understood why we insist on the Palestinian state. What is the meaning of this state, even on a part of the Palestinian soil? It means that I will be able to feel my humanity and it means that there will be no justification for carrying the weapons in Lebanon or anywhere else because then the Palestinian will, naturally, go to his homeland to live in it. Whoever wants to stay where he is, his status becomes the same as that of all the Arab citizens in the Arab countries, no more and no less.

Somebody may ask: Will this state be big enough for all the Palestinian people? My answer is: How many Lebanese are living in Lebanon and how many Lebanese are expatriates?

[Question] Those living in Lebanon are 3 million and the expatriates and 9 million.

[Answer] Excellent. It is enough for these 9 million that their passports are not forged and it is enough for them that they feel that they belong to a homeland.

Physical residence is not important. What is important is the spiritual residence, i.e. the symbol. Yes, the symbol of belonging is the only important thing. Without this, there is no solution, in my opinion.

[Question] Any reasonable man observing the Arab wars against Israel realizes that the Arab states have failed several times to regain the occupied territories by way of the regular armies. On the other hand, the Lebanese

citizen finds that instead of resorting to underground fedayeen action, the Palestinian organizations resort to creating regular armies in the manner whose failure has been proven. Can this phenomenon, and all the camouflaged fatigues and heavy weapons accompanying it in the camps, be explained.

[Answer] I want to answer you with the same frankness. A man speaking about an incident without speaking about the circumstances involved is like a man seeing with one eye. Therefore, let us look at both sides. When we speak about the heavy weapons we must also look at the Israeli artillery in Sa'd Haddad's arsenal--an artillery that shells the villages which believe, practically, that they are shelled because of my presence there. If these villages don't feel that I have the same gun that Sa'd Haddad has, they feel that I have abandoned them.

This is the reason for the presence of some heavy weapons in the hands of the resistance. When the causes disappear, there will no longer be any call for their presence and we will give them up with utter simplicity.

On the other hand, there are Israeli aircraft that fly boisterously over our heads day and night at a time when the Lebanese government does not have any deterrent means.

You may tell me that the resistance cannot shoot down the Israeli aircraft that fly at high altitudes (F-16 aircraft). The reply is that I can at least keep them away from the camps and not give them the opportunity to fly at low altitudes and mow down our children and our youths with their machineguns directly.

To be very frank also, we were forced to use the heavy weapons during the two-year war when the western area and Tall al-Za'tar were being hit. But today, I defy anybody to prove the presence of a single heavy weapon in the [western] area, unless you consider the DSHK or the Klashnikof a heavy weapon.

Armed Manifestations

[Question] What about the armed manifestations?

[Answer] Insofar as the armed manifestations are concerned, we support any measure that has been adopted or that will be adopted in the future. I tell you sincerely that we will be the first to eliminate the armed manifestations, even if this leads to a military clash among us.

But don't ask me to be more royalist than the king and to give up my weapon at a time when I find tens of rifles directed at my chest, beginning with Sa'd Haddad and ending with the last man like him.

Objections Against Sa'd Haddad

[Question] What are your objections to Sa'd Haddad and why did you make him your enemy even before he had dealt with Israel?

[Answer] I want to ask in my turn: Why did Sa'd Haddad consider us enemies and why did he fight us?

[Question] Sa'd Haddad has told one of the information media that he fought against Israel when he was in the service of the legitimate government and that, therefore, he was one of the strongest supporters of the Palestinian resistance. But he suddenly found himself surrounded by the joint forces that blocked all the paths to safety in his face and the face of his group whereas Israel opened its gates and saved them from certain death. We understand from this that you, and not him, initiated the hostility. What is your opinion?

[Answer] If you want to simplify things in this manner, I have no objection to the simplification. But the fact is that the matter is not this simple.

Here I will again repeat what I have already said, namely that it is difficult to separate things from each other. Therefore, Sa'd Haddad's problem is part of a whole and is not a self-contained problem existing in isolation of what is happening and what surrounds it on the Lebanese stage.

The issue of hostility of Sa'd Haddad is not one of personal hostility between us and him. He is one of the symbols of a group operating on the instructions of a certain command.

Frankly, we are not the ones who asked for the Syrian forces. Those who asked for them are Lebanese ex-President Sulayman Franjiyah, with the welcome of the leaderships of the Phalanges and Liberal parties leaderships and of Sa'd Haddad in particular. We were fighting against the Syrian forces, and everybody knows this.

Now that the equation has changed, we are not to be blamed. They must reconsider their calculations carefully and must determine their goals more precisely in the future.

[Question] But the problem of al-Qulay'ah and Marj'uyun started before the entry of the Syrians. Isn't it so?

[Answer] No. Let me refresh your memory better because I have experienced the events on the inside and I know them more than you do.

During the two-year war, we had no problem whatsoever in the south. On the contrary, whoever wanted to rest went to the south.

But when the war subsided in Beirut, the southern front was opened (the Deterrence Forces did not enter this area). Imagine the plan--and I say the plan even though I am not one of those who always talk of plans and who level accusations offhandedly at the American intelligence and agents [sic]. But unfortunately, every plan blossoms and grows when it finds a fertile land for its roots to get hold and a climate suitable for its growth.

Ex-President Franjiah once asked me: Abu-Iyad, I want to know how Tyre port can receive weapons designated for the Palestinians at a time when Israel can blow up and destroy the port any time it wants and yet it doesn't do it, why? I told him at the time: This is true and Israel is aware of every piece of weaponry we receive. Israel doesn't touch the weapons and lets them reach us for a simple reason, namely because its interest calls for continuation of the war in Lebanon. If the weapons don't reach me, the war will not continue because the Lebanese Front will then become stronger than me. Israel has no interest in having the front becoming stronger than the Palestinians or in us becoming stronger than the front because it wants the stage to remain aflame and wants all to continue fighting.

The Christians think that Israel likes them. This is wrong. It doesn't like us or them. The proof that it doesn't like them is: Why didn't Israel hit the ships loaded with weapons that were coming to us in Tyre port?

The truth is that it didn't do so, not when we were fighting the Syrians and not when we were fighting our brothers the Christians, and not even when we were fighting each other. It didn't do so because its interest, and that of the United States behind it, is in continued fighting and in the constant attrition of our resources in secondary conflicts. It is regrettable that we, as Arabs, are a willing instrument in Israel's hand most of the time and that we implement these plans like sheep, not knowing or being aware of what we are doing.

As for the statement of Sa'd Haddad that you have mentioned in the question saying that he supported us and that he fought with us against Israel, I cannot deny this and it may be true. But are we the enemies of Sa'd Haddad personally? No, we are not his personal enemies.

[Question] Can the Lebanese issue be solved with violence?

[Answer] This is not at all possible. Review Lebanon's long history. Lebanon is tantamount to an equation. When the Marunites and the Islamic sects agreed to coexist within the framework of a single state, there was a well-known agreement and a covenant calling for loyalty to Lebanon alone. "No east and no west," this is the gist of the equation and any flaw developing in this equation destroys it.

When Camille Sham'un, Pierre al-Jumayyil and other leaders bring themselves to task and when we and those in the National Movement and the National Front who support us bring ourselves to task and engage in self-criticism, then the solution will get closer because we will then learn where we have committed our mistakes and our follies and everything will end peacefully.

Violence is no use at all and it has never been the way to solve any problem.

I will give you as an example of this the two-year war: Neither could they advance to al-Shiyah nor could we reach 'Ayn al-Rummanah. We stayed where we had been and we got killed for nothing.

Authorizing al-Jumayyil

[Question] Brother Abu-Iyad, why is what is valid locally not valid at the level of the Middle East? In other words, why do you think that the violence that cannot achieve a thing in Lebanon can achieve everything outside it? Can peace realize what war cannot realize or not?

[Answer] You say peace, but what peace? Would you agree that, as a result of self-rule, 400,000 Palestinians stay in your country and be resettled in it forever?

[Question] Of course not.

[Answer] If you agree, then I authorize you in the name of the Palestinian people to negotiation on my behalf on the issue of self-rule. Consequently, I authorize brother Pierre al-Jumayyil to negotiation on my behalf. Let him ask Israel and ask the Americans what self-rule is. If they don't tell him that self-rule means resettlement, don't call me Abu-Iyad.

Now I want to ask you, as a Lebanese, with the logic of the Lebanese Front: Would you accept any alien on your land?

[Question] No.

[Answer] Definitely not. You cannot agree to have a single inch of your land occupied by a Palestinian, a Syrian or somebody else. True or not?

[Question] True.

[Answer] I consider all of Palestine my land. Yet, I will accept a Palestinian state on only 22 percent of the Palestinian land. On this basis, what do you think? Am I supporting peace or war?

[Question] Peace, of course.

[Answer] Alright, don't you know that there are rejectionist fronts and acceptance fronts? And the moderation characterizing the PLO at the international level and Abu-'Ammar's visit to Kreisky, Austria and Turkey, is all this remote from the logic of our political moderation?

[Question] No.

Resettlement Plan

[Answer] But there is something called the United States and a Zionist lobby controlling it. This is why al-Sadat's treason came as a violent shock to us. This is because we had gone along with al-Sadat to the degree of blindness. He was our personal friend and we supported him completely. He said to us: Geneva. We did not oppose. He said: Negotiations. We also did not oppose. But we expected this to be within the framework of a comprehensive Arab solution. Had al-Sadat delayed a little, Israel would have capitulated to a Palestinian state in spite of itself.

Al-Sadat's real treason was in his acceptance of the logic of self-rule. I am ready to show you the Egyptian passports he has prepared for a 100,000 Palestinians living in his country.

The resettlement began at his end. Al-Sadat accepted the plan that Begin had brought from Poland. The Jews "got a beating" on the hands of the Germans in World War II and some of them took refuge in Poland. There, the Polish Government gave them a self-rule affecting people but not the land. Begin "is now trying to apply to us in Palestine" this self-rule which he had gotten in Poland.

Palestine is land [sic]. What I mean is that in the 2000-year history about which they talk, the Jews lived on this land for 70 years only. I am saying these things because they always say that Palestine is the promised land and the land of "I don't know what."

I am keeping silent on all this history and I say that I accept a state on a part of the Palestinian soil. Why don't they give me this opportunity? Why?

[Question] Wouldn't the opportunity be made available to you through direct dialogue?

[Answer] What dialogue? Can any man in the world offer his enemy more than al-Sadat, the head of the biggest Arab country, has offered?

After long negotiations, he surrendered to them himself, Egypt and the oil. He will even divert the Nile to al-Naqab [Negev] and yet they have given him nothing in return, not even that trivial self-rule about which they are talking.

[Question] Perhaps Israel has given al-Sadat no concessions at the Palestinian level but has given him his right at the Egyptian level to demonstrate to the others that direct negotiations and recognition of Israel are the basis of every concession. Now, the question is: Are you ready to negotiate with Israel if there are no preconditions?

[Answer] It is proven historically that any revolution in the world and any state that negotiates from a position other than one of strength will slip into endless concessions.

Al-Sadat fought and then stopped the fighting. He then started to make concessions one after the other and to the degree where he has now reached the point of inability. They are now looking for a substitute for al-Sadat because he is terribly weak at the domestic level. Do not ask me for things in advance like all those who contacted us for mediation, saying: "Stop the operations, even if only for a certain period of time."

Israel's logic is not to recognize the PLO and not to allow the creation of a Palestinian state and not and not and endless notes. All this is insignificant when we are strong because strength overcomes all difficulties and unties all knots.

Fedayeen Operations

[Question] Do we understand from your words that the coming days will witness an escalation in the fedayeen operations against Israel, perhaps to make up for the time squandered by the revolution in its fight against the Lebanese in the two-year war?

[Answer] The operations inside [the occupied territories] continue and they are all from inside. This means that the people are escalating the operations without orders. By the way, I would like to take this opportunity to say that the worst part of the two-year war is that it diverted our attention from fighting the Zionist enemy.

Establishment of Palestinian State

[Question] What is the obstacle preventing so far the declaration of a Palestinian government in exile?

[Answer] Sir, if the Palestinian government were the solution, we would declare it. There is nothing easier than to declare a government and to issue the decision forming it. But the PLO has powers beyond those of any government that can be formed or may be formed in the future.

In any case, I want to remind you here of the Government of All Palestine which started in a building and ended in a kitchen.

We will, however, declare this government one day. We will declare it in the Palestinian state. This state is coming shortly and I see it as clearly as I see you and the brother in front of me. Believe me and quote me as saying: The Palestinian state will be realized in a shorter time than most observers expect. The contacts being made at the European and international levels and the recent visit of Abu-al-Lutf to Belgium are in isolation from any political issue.

I do not want to divulge a secret here but what I want to say is that all the contacts taking place bring the close, and very close, zero hour closer.

In any case, there is a world public opinion that now acknowledges the Palestinian people's right. Even the Americans themselves have never paid as much attention to the issue as they are paying now. Therefore, what concerns us is to keep Lebanon calm so that we may be able to move. When I hear Amin al-Jumayyil speak abroad about the Palestinian issue I consider him a lot better than Shaykh "Ahmad ibn Husayn" when the latter speaks on the same issue. Amin's words are better and stronger. This is what I want to say. Amin and others constitute a support for us. So why should I fight him?

I am not sectarian and I do not like to kill by the identity card [which in Lebanon includes the religion of bearer].

Why should I be counted as a figure with the National Movement and why should I be counted as a figure with the Muslims in this country. I do not like to be counted with anybody. But there are sides that push me forcefully to be a figure and I don't want this.

[Question] In your capacity as the engineer of the relations between the state on the one hand and the National Front, National Movement and the resistance on the other and through your experience with all these sides, have you not developed a certain visualization for a plan to solve the Lebanese issue?

[Answer] The solution will become available when we, as Palestinians and as Lebanese, sever our threads, be they Arab or international, with the outside circles. When we cut off these threads, beginning with those with Israel and ending with those with the Arab Maghreb and Arab East, we will reach an understanding immediately.

[Question] The other side is ready. Are you ready for this step?

[Answer] If the other side is actually ready to hold a dialogue with the National Movement and the National Front, then it is natural that I am ready because whoever wants to hold a political dialogue, he has to hold it with all the parties concerned and not with just one side. Anything else is futile.

[Question] There is fear in the wake of the 'Arafat-Sarkis meeting that you will cause President Sarkis to be lost in the Lebanese conflicts, as you did with ex-President Franjiyah. What is your opinion?

[Answer] I respect and appreciate President Sarkis. He is the symbol of the unity of this country and his stay in power means continuation of the symbol and of the national unity. So don't talk to me about loss and getting lost, may God keep you.

[Question] Which is the side fit to hold a dialogue with the Lebanese Front?

[Answer] As you know, the Lebanese Front is no longer one front, the same way that the National Movement is no longer one movement. It is the same here and there and I think they know each other well.

[Question] Was the Sarkis-'Arafat meeting an offhanded meeting that it produced no practical resolutions, or what?

[Answer] The meeting was not a question of improvisation or not. When the president assumed office, he could not solve all the conflicts in a matter of days or weeks. All he had to do was to stand fast in the face of all obstacles. In fact, matters have proceeded from good to better. Moreover, the aim of the 'Arafat-Sarkis meeting was not to find a magic wand to solve the crisis in a matter of hours. The issue discussed was the issue of the south. Within the limits of what was discussed concerning the south, there was agreement.

There are numerous parties performing on this stage. It is true that I am frank, but not to the limit of revealing all that is in my heart.

[Question] You will go to Syria with the National Movement and the National Front. The question is: Will you (the resistance) present a solution plan out of your desire to pacify the atmosphere?

[Answer] The meeting will not solve the crisis, nor will other meetings. Numerous meetings were held in the past with the Syrian brothers and with others and I cannot divulge to you the content or the nature of those meetings.

But from my meetings with President Sarkis, and others, we have found that we cannot tell the Syrians: We have agreed on such and such, so kindly accept what we have agreed upon. It is exactly as the opposite is not permissible.

I say that we must reach agreement with all the parties concerned in one thrust. Believe me when I say that if every side severs its outside tie, be it Arab or international, the crisis will be solved within seconds.

Contacts With Israel

[Question] It was rumored last summer that contacts took place between the resistance and some Israelis abroad. How true are these rumors?

[Answer] A decision taken by the Palestinian [National] Council calls for holding contacts with all the democratic, progressive and national forces inside and outside Israel. This decision gives us the opportunity to contact any non-Zionist Jew and this is what actually happened.

[Question] How do you interpret the moderate stances taken by Moshe Dayan recently and do you think that they are a form of trickery and cunning?

[Answer] No, I don't think they are a form of trickery. In any case, I have just told you that history has become with us. Israel cannot continue to play the game of the poor and persecuted party forever. The world has come to acknowledge now something called Palestine and the Palestinian people.

[Question] It is repeatedly said that the resistance and the Lebanese Front may find themselves in one trench. How do you explain this?

[Answer] I wish, and I say this sincerely and with all my heart and not just as a courtesy or a nicety, that all the Lebanese, led by the Lebanese Front, would be with us in the trench.

[Question] Are there contacts between you and the Lebanese Front?

[Answer] The contacts are suspended at present because of Amin al-Jumayyil's travels.

[Question] Through the resolutions and the projections made by the Lebanese Front, where do you meet and where do you part company?

[Answer] I have no objection to the Lebanese Front or to others except on the basis of the position this or that side takes toward me and my cause. They too should establish their objections to me on the basis of what positions I take toward Lebanon. This is unless what is meant [by the question] is a separate understanding between the front and the Palestinian resistance and desertion of all the other parties concerned. If so, then the issue is a losing one.

I wish that the rest of the brothers would give me the right and honor to negotiate in their name. I also wish that there would emerge from the Lebanese Front reasonable people who understand our circumstances as Amin al-Jumayyil understands them.

Forgive me, I do not want to dwell on this subject so as not to hurt anybody unwittingly.

[Question] Bashir [al-Jumayyil] also understands your circumstances but what he holds against you is your intervention in the Lebanese politics.

[Answer] (Laughingly) My friend, Shaykh Bashir is attacking us relentlessly, why?

Meeting of Frank Discussion

[Question] What is required, as you have said, is to reach understanding. Isn't it so?

[Answer] Yes, let all our affairs be presented openly and let us tell each other what are the things that scare us and the things that scare them. There must be a meeting of open discussion between us to eliminate the fear from the hearts. We will then settle our differences and find the solution suitable for all of us.

[Question] The Lebanese Front's position is very clear and is summed up in that the weapons present in the hands of the foreigners who support the joint forces upset the Lebanese equation of balances.

[Answer] This is a faulty starting point and an inaccurate view of things. Delving into the sea of details will do us no good. What is required now is for every side to acknowledge the presence of the other side. What Lebanon has suffered so far is enough. This is why we should all cede our rights for the sake of Lebanon that has suffered enough woes and catastrophes.

We in the organizations have our numerous differences but we give them up for the sake of the cause. Duty calls on all the Lebanese to give up in their turn everything for the sake of Lebanon. The "failure to cede" led to the war and perhaps ceding now will lead to ending the war.

[Question] Brother Abu-Iyad, Bashir al-Jumayyil concentrated in the speeches that he has made recently on attacking the United States, considering it the party that has embroiled Lebanon and dragged it to its present situation. Don't you think that this is a meeting point between you and him?

[Answer] There is a joke that I always tell the brothers. This joke is that when I read Shaykh Bashir's speeches I feel that I have mistaken the title and replaced his name by that of brother Muhsin Ibrahim.

[Question] You haven't answered my question yet.

[Answer] He is fighting the United States and we are with him in the battle.

[Question] What is required at the level of restoring the relations with the front?

[Answer] The same way I appreciate their feelings as Lebanese, they should appreciate my feelings as a Palestinian. This means that the harmful word at times closes many paths whereas the nice word opens many hearts. I read AL-'AMAL and AL-AHRAR constantly and I see those long and broad editorials in their front pages every day. This is a disgrace. Believe me that I try hard in the speeches I make on all occasions to avoid words such as "isolationism, fascism, reaction" and others because I don't like to pour oil on fire and because, upon my honor, I want this country to have rest from gossip, hatred and malice and want a new page bright with hope and love to be opened. Believe me, I am only a passerby in this country. I and my people have a little time left for us to depart to the motherland. I mean by this that all the Lebanese should forget their differences because this country is theirs and they have no other country. It is a pity on their part to waste it with frivolous and meaningless differences. Let them stop this propaganda war among themselves because it is more dangerous than the rifle and the gun with its power of destruction.

[Question] The people are afraid of coming battles. What is your opinion?

[Answer] After the Camp David accord, I was afraid of a battle. Last April, I was afraid that matters would return to what they had been during the two-year war. But it seems that the south was the alternative victim and the south has gotten its share throughout 7 successive months.

I believe that nobody has any interest in any future battle.

[Question] Should a future battle, God forbid, take place, will you be a party in it?

[Answer] Not at all because we have no interest in fighting any side and we will not again waste our time on a picnic over Lebanon's quicksands. I call on all with all my heart to clear matters peacefully and to settle their differences. I also call on them to always raise the slogan of abandoning all that is external, be it Arab or foreign, and to return to their previous equation because there is no alternative to it.

8494

CSO: 4802

IMPLICATIONS OF POPE'S U.S. VISIT TO ISLAMIC, ARAB WORLD EXAMINED

Kishk's Article on Visit

London AL-HAWADITH in Arabic 26 Oct 79 pp 36-38, 43-44

[Article by Jalal Kishk: "Fanatic Viewpoint on Visit of Pope John Paul II to United States; Has Confrontation Between Christian West and Muslim East Started; Intensifying Conviction in West on Need to Use Force Against Third World to Solve Crisis of Advanced World; Rosalyn Carter Tells Pope: You Have Come to Us as Example of Vision That Unites Mankind—Vision of Our Creator; World Is Eager for Spiritual Leadership and Pope's Approach Gives Him Great Opportunity to Succeed in Role of Savior of Christian World; Most Serious Occurrence in Pope's Visit to United States Is His Announcement of 'Termination of Missionary Work Among Jews;' What About Missionary Work Among Muslims; Middle East Got Longest Paragraph in Pope's Speech Before U.N. General Assembly Because Middle East Is Quest and Urgent Issue of Europe; Iranian Professor Says: Pope Wanted to Eliminate Traces of Khomeyni and of Islam From U.S. Information; Pakistani Professor Says: West Tricked Us, Maintaining Its Religion and Missiles and Leaving Us With Poverty and Atheism"]

[Text] AL-HAWADITH is generally perceived as a paper that publishes whatever information it receives and whatever ideas fit for reading occur to the minds of its editors [presumably meaning reporters]. In confirmation of this common concept, and not in any way as a means of testing it, I sent this unfriendly dispatch on the Pope's visit which observers here believe will constitute a historical landmark and a turning point that will affect our future for several generations to come or at least, as THE U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT has said, "the Pope's visit will influence the world's non-religious life for several years to come." (15 October 1979)

The Pope's visit has been a complete political act. Even though Carter—in his capacity as the president of the biggest Christian country which was until a few years ago hostile to the Catholics and which is still one of the few countries, if not the only country, in the world that do not grant the papal delegate the status of a diplomat, not to mention of the title of

ambassador which this delegate enjoys in most countries of the world--was compelled to say, in order to reassure the non-Catholics, "I have agreed with the Pope that the church should not get involved in politics and should not be linked to a political system," the Pope left no political issue which he has not discussed, beginning with the Lebanese problem, "coexistence," oppression in Latin America, the North-South dialogue and ending with the future of Jerusalem and with Camp David.

There is nothing over which people can disagree as much as they disagree over religion, contrary to the common illusion that religions unite people and to the illusion that the faith of peoples can unite one day over one religion. The most ferocious wars have been the ones waged in the name of religion or, to put it more precisely, out of fanaticism for a religion. Though there are economic, social, political and geographic causes behind the religious wars, this does not mean that those wars should not be described as religious wars, considering that their commanders declared them in the name of religion and that the masses were killing and getting killed in the name and for the sake of religion. Therefore, even though the Pope's visit has taken place in the name of religion, it has provoked and will continue to provoke sharp political arguments in more than one place.

I have lived an exciting week following up the details of the "pilgrim Pope"--the first Pope of the Catholic Church to tour the United States and to be received at the White House where the tradition was one of hostility to the Catholics, of wariness toward them and of accusing them of subservience to a foreign country. As we have said, the United States is the cultural extension of and the heir to Great Britain whose renaissance was established on succession into an independent church, on hostility to Catholicism and on banning the throne and all influential positions to Catholics. Until the 18th century, Catholics were still hanged in New York. The United States waged war against the Catholic Europe in Latin America (95 percent Catholic). Pope Pius IX appealed to the U.S. Catholics to desert the [U.S.] army and join the Mexican army in the U.S.-Mexican war (1848). When Kennedy, a Catholic, ran in the elections for the presidency and was compelled to issue an announcement pledging to abide by the separation of state from church and not to succumb to any authority outside the United States, it was as if he converted to Protestantism. When the Vatican men protested, John Kennedy said wrathfully: "Now I know why Henry VIII seceded with the British church." It is true that the situation has changed and that the Catholics have now become the second sect in wealth and education--the first is the Jewish sect--and that the Catholic Church in the United States owns 50 billion dollars, mostly in real estate investments. However, wariness of Catholicism and of the papal influence is still an effective element in the U.S. policy and the U.S. thinking. This is why it is a must to ask: Why this enthusiastic reception [for the Pope] and what are its dimensions and consequences?

I have preferred not to express my opinion in this article so that I may not be exposed to more than the charge of disseminating atheism—a charge whose perpetrator, scientists are unanimous, is not an atheist—and why I have preferred to transmit the viewpoint of observers who have viewed the visit from various angles.

On the morning of Wednesday, the second day of the papal visit, the telephone in my room at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York rang. The caller was my friend Hasan Shari'atizadch, an Iranian professor teaching electronics at a university in the western United States and one of the most zealous men for Khomeyni's revolution. This professor had come to meet Dr Yazdi, the Iranian minister of foreign affairs, during the latter's visit to the United Nations. I had become acquainted with Dr Shari'ati in Beirut and London. He was violent in his arguments, fanatically opposed to the western civilization and in a hurry for the shah's downfall. I used to warn him against going too far in his zeal so that Iran may not be afflicted with what has afflicted the Arab world which had rejoiced in the downfall of its reactionaries only to be visited by worse tribulation.

Dr Hasan said: I am inviting you tonight to the most amazing dinner party. I have been able to get two tickets by using my connections and we will go together.

I was aware of his sarcastic and symbolic way. I tried to find out what he meant by this amazing dinner to which we were to go with tickets. However, he hastened to say:

We will attend the Pope's mass at Yankee Stadium with 80,000 guests. Perhaps you and me will be the only Muslims at this dinner.

I said: And where is the dinner?

He answered: Haven't you read the papers? Don't you listen to the radio? Don't you watch television? They are meeting there to eat Christ's flesh and to drink his blood.

I shouted: Damn you. You will become an old man while remaining as fanatic as a teenager.

He sputtered with the zeal of revolutionary missionaries: If we grow our beards, we are accused of reaction and fanaticism but if 80,000 people meet in the capital of the industrial and financial world—the city of dissolution where 5,000 under age girls are raped every night and where an incident [crime] takes place every 12 seconds, the city that built the atomic bomb and that has reached the moon [sentence incomplete]. This city has 80,000 young and middle-aged men and women who work in various professions and who have different educational backgrounds—80,000 men and women who will shove each other to eat Christ's body and drink his blood so that they may

be united with Him, exactly like the primitive people of Australia and Africa who eat the lion's heart to become lions. These 80,000 are the ones who have gotten the opportunity to have the honor of the holy communion. If the place permitted, 100 million people would take part in the dinner. Meanwhile, we the Muslims are accused of believing in myths.

I said: Stop it. You know that this is purely symbolic.

He answered: And this is the most dangerous aspect of the issue. Were they to really eat and drink, then their behavior would be understandable. But for the elite of the western world's civilization to believe that with the blessing of a man bread turns into Christ's body and wine into His blood and for this elite to consume them with happiness, then isn't this the basis of the western civilization's brutality? If they drink the blood of Him whom they love and who sacrificed for their sake, then what will they do with their enemies?

I said to enrage him: They love their enemies and they bless those who curse them, such as you.

He said: Come let us go see a live show of the beginning of the Crusades and of the trip of Peter the Pious who mobilize the west, or Europe, against the east nine centuries ago.

I tried to dissuade him, for fear that he might become emotional or get into an argument with a zealot who may turn my friend's death into a miracle! I said that it would be better for us to watch the ceremony on television and that my Pakistani friend Ahmad al-Marudi, a secular atheist who teaches political science at Georgetown University in Washington would join us. Al-Marudi had come to New York to help the Pakistani U.N. delegation to refute the charge that Pakistan is trying to produce an atomic bomb which people here call the "Muslim bomb," considering that there is already a Christian bomb, a communist bomb, a Buddhist bomb and a Jewish bomb. Only the Muslims remain without a bomb. I also said that my friend Muhammad Marshal, a Black American Muslim who teaches comparative civilization in a New Jersey university would also join us. Marshal had learned of my presence here and came for more discussions. There was also a fourth friend, namely Jayyid 'Ayyad who is an Egyptian Christian residing in New York. 'Ayyad immigrated in the 1960's because he had gotten married to a Muslim woman and converted to Islam and it was thus impossible for him to live or work [in Egypt]. It was evident from the group structure that it could not take a neutral stance toward the Pope's visit and perhaps this gives the group's opinion its weight amidst the wave of enthusiasm for the visit.

We agreed that we would not ruin the viewing with discussion or comments, that each of us would write down his observations and that we would discuss them at the end of the visit. I have decided, as I have already said, to transmit some of these observations. It is true that they are like the

observations of the group of blind people who were asked to describe an elephant after each of them had touched a part of its body. However, the picture with which each of us has emerged contains a part of the truth, or at least the impact of the visit on each of us.

The Iranian's Opinion

My friend Hasan has written:

"The Pope's visit is the direct reply to the Iranian revolution. This revolution, led by Khomeyni, has been able to project Islam in all the information media of the world. For 3 months, the masses in the west have had Islam for breakfast and Islam for lunch and then spent the night with the Muslims in the press, radio and television. There remains no question concerning Islam and the Muslims that has not been asked and there is no westerner concerned with public affairs who has not wondered about this religion which is capable of moving the masses and about this old man who is nearing his 80th year of age and who has been able to topple the strongest regime in the third world without weapons.

"Khomeyni has not gone to the information media but with the strength of the revolution, he has brought the information media to the mosque. Thus when they thought that the last nail had been driven into the coffin of the Islamic civilization, they suddenly found the Iranian revolution reviving the giant and demonstrating the stirrings of the Islamic movement or the Islamic revival in more than one place, and this time in the form of the revolution of the Third World.

"So the church has had to make a move. If there is no reason for the information media to go to the Vatican, then let the Pope go to the information media. The Pope's trip to Poland was a propaganda demonstration to convince the west that not only Islam fights communism. The trip was also a visa for the U.S. information media, which was controlled by the Jews, to visit the remains of the Auschwitz camp where Jews were tortured and to underline human rights. But the media in a communist country do not provide the needed international coverage. This is why the Pope has come to the international center of information--to the United States--to eliminate the traces of Khomeyni and of Islam from the television screens. As Hayes Johnson has said in his editorial in the WASHINGTON POST: "The Pope has restored religion to the frontpage bannerlines day after day and to the television screens hour after hour." (8 October 1979)

"In the 1950's and 1960's, religions--or rather say Christianity in Europe and the United States--experienced a big decline in the number of believers and members. A survey conducted by NEWSWEEK on the number of clergymen who abandoned the clergy during the reign of Pope Paul VI says that the number amounted to 22,324 clergymen out of a total of 23,357 clergymen who requested to be absolved of their vows. The Pope approved all but 1,033

requests. These "apostates" are the ones who could not harmonize their values and teachings with the church values or harmonize life's necessities and nature's instincts on the one hand and with the church prohibitions on the other. With the intensifying criticism against the church's political, social and sexual positions and even against the church's positions on divorce and birth control and, what is more important, with the prosperity prevailing in the west--thanks to cheap oil--the number of students in the Vatican's theological schools has dropped since 1965 from 49,000 to 11,200 students, or less than one quarter. In the United States, the number of priests has dropped within 10 years to 14,998 thus decreasing by 67 percent. The number of nuns is now 50,000 whereas it was 181,421 in 1966. There has also been an evident drop in the number of young clergymen. This drop has reached the degree whereby 75 percent of the Catholic clergymen will be over the age of 65 in the 1980's (Pope Paul VI's abolition of the right of cardinals above 80 years of age to vote has been considered one of his greatest accomplishments). This draught has not been confined to the Catholic Church which has the biggest [Christian] following (700 million followers) and which constitutes, as the WASHINGTON POST has described it, "the oldest and most efficient bureaucratic establishment in the world," as well as the most diverse and disciplined establishment at the international level. The Jewish and communist attempts to compete with it at the level of creating an international organization have failed. However, the movements of returning to religion began in the 1970's with the receding wave of prosperity and with the failure of the secular establishments to solve the problems of the western societies. But those abandoning the church turned eastward, seeking Islam or the untried religions of the Far East. In Africa, Islam spread during the 1950's and 1960's with the disappearance of the European domination and with the popular reaction against this domination and its establishments. The church was one of its most prominent establishments in the life of the masses. Moreover, some Christian rulers imposed by the European domination over a Muslim majority tried to preserve their positions and the unity of their countries by moving closer to the religion of the majority. But the church quickly rectified the situation and was able to dissociate itself from the colonialist European history. It consecrated the first black cardinal whereas its previous history of more than 19 centuries had not included a black man. Polygamy was permitted in Africa and the church intervened clearly in the events of Biafra, Southern Sudan and Chad. The Christian circles in the west blessed the intervention of the Christian ruler of a Muslim state whose capital is Dar es Salaam to topple the Muslim Idi Amin, the friend of the Arabs. Idi Amin has not been the only murderer in Africa but rather the Muslim murderer there! A U.S. television announcer said on the occasion that the Pope's miracles include the overthrow of Idi Amin and his replacement by a Christian ruler in a single year. Bokassa, the Christian African ruler who dared to convert to Islam, also fell. He was toppled by the forces of the biggest Catholic country in the world. Still, (BOIS NEWS) warns that the Muslims in France have become the second largest community and that they have outpaced the Protestants and the Jews (1 October 1979).

"It was thought that the adoption of secularism by most of the Islamic countries and the emergence in them of regimes fighting religion under various slogans had ended the eastern problem. But the Iranian revolution came, as I have already said, to touch off the crisis anew and to project the historical confrontation between the Christian west and the Muslim east.

"So the church moved.

"The press here expects a religious revival as a result of the papal visit. The press also expects a rush for joining the clergy ranks similar to that which took place in the 1930's following the economic crisis [the depression, presumably]. This point is very important. The economic crisis [depression] pushed the youth toward war and religion--religion in the church and war in the Fascist and Nazi parties. The west is now approaching an international crisis. This visit by the Pope may perhaps be the beginning of the religious move and the French army's move in Bakassa's empire may also be the beginning of the return of European imperialism. There is an ever-growing conviction in the west of the need to use force against the third world to solve the crisis of the advanced world. The proposal submitted to President Carter to declare the OPEC a national enemy against whom the Americans should be united is a sound proposal theoretically and one that reflects the thinking of an ever-expanding current in the United States and the west. But the fault in this proposal is that it has disregarded two fundamental elements. The first is that the masses do not proceed to fight under frank and open economic slogans. There has to be an ideological cover. Even the ships of the first colonists looted gold and spices and engaged in piracy under the banners of Christianity and of the white civilization. Therefore, an ideological cover is a must to mobilize the masses. The second reason [element] is that the U.S., or even western, leader to perform this role is not available. The role is real and needed, but it is still looking for a hero--or a world looking for a leader. The western media are trying to project the Pope in this role. TIME [magazine] (15 October 1979) has said: "Within one year, the Pope has jumped into the spotlight as a shining leader for whom the world is thirsting--a leader capable of stirring people to realize accomplishments bigger than their thinking. He is the man of all ages and of all faiths. He is the star in the sky." The magazine quotes Billy Graham as saying: "He [the Pope] is the most respected religious leader in the world." The magazine further cites Reverend Avery Dulles, the son of John Foster Dulles and the nephew of Allen Dulles (a former U.S. secretary of state and a former U.S. [CIA] intelligence director who ousted Europe from the Middle East) who is studying theology at the Catholic University, as having said: "The world is yearning for a religious leadership. But this leadership needs to be embodied in a person. The Pope's style gives him a great opportunity to succeed in this role." NEWSWEEK has said: "The manner in which he arouses enthusiasm evokes the feeling that the Holy Spirit has appeared in the United States."

"The Pope's visit has projected the slogan and nominated the leadership: For the sake of Christ, for the unity of the Christian world and against the evil Islam and the Muslims (I am still quoting the Iranian brother's comment) who are allying themselves with the devil and withholding oil from the lamps of the west. The leadership is this Polish Pope with his sweet smile, who is firmly determined to preserve the church teachings and who is so open as to whistle with the teenagers in Madison Square Garden!

"Is it incidental that the Pope has not mentioned Islam and the Muslims except once, namely when he spoke about special guarantees concerning Jerusalem? Is it incidental that all the papers and radio and television stations have not tried to get the comment of a single Muslim [on Pope's visit], even though they have asked all other sects and groups, beginning with the Jews and the atheists and ending with the supporters of free homosexuality? Is this because there is a feeling that the visit and the Christian revival are directed against Islam and the Islam revival represented by Iran's revolution?

"The Pope has been extremely courteous to the Jews, beginning with his visit to Poland which was tantamount to the visa on his passport [sic] and his repeated talk about the Jewish [sic] concentration camps, his saluting the Jews with the word 'shalom,' his talk of the common Jewish heritage and his words: 'I address a special greeting to the Jewish community leaders who have honored me with their presence here. I met a few months ago with a number of Jewish leaders in Europe and we recalled the words of the second Vatican synod which was held under the leadership of my predecessor, Pope Paul VI--the Synod which decided that our two communities are bound by religious faith. We acknowledge very clearly that our common future is through fraternal dialogue and fruitful cooperation. This is what is happening now. As one who has shared your suffering in my country, Poland, I greet you in Hebrew. Shalom.' (From Pope's speech at Battery Park, New York, 4 October 1979)

"Perhaps the most serious declaration or gift presented by the Pope to the Jewish community during his trip is his declaration that 'missionary work among the Jews will be stopped.' Thus, the missionary efforts will be confined to the Muslims. The Jews have considered the missionary work an act of aggression that arouses hatred and constitutes a rejection of their faith. More than one Muslim side has tried to persuade the Vatican to stop missionary work among the Muslims because of its ramifications but all their efforts have failed.

"It is the right of the Jews who have seen Iran's direction under the canopy of the Islamic tide to rejoice at the Christian-Islamic confrontation (!) Rabbi Mark, chairman of the U.S. Jewish Committee, has said: 'The Jewish community has been deeply touched by the Pope's charisma and by his words

words at Battery Park which have reflected love and respect. There has also been a strong response to his reference to the torture camps. The Pope's predecessors used to ignore the 150 million non-Catholic Americans."

Concluding his statements, the Iranian friend says: "The Crusade has started. Its factors had been gathering since the end of World War II and the independence of the Islamic world and have been given momentum by the Iranian revolution. Perhaps this explains why Dr Yazdi, the minister of foreign affairs, focused in his speech before the United Nations on pointing out the difference between Islam and Catholicism. His focusing on this point was the result of his feeling that the Islamic revolution in Iran is the target of this challenge. It is worth noting that the Crusades started when the first Shi'ite state came into existence in the Islamic world." (He means by this state the Fatimid state in western Asia and North Africa.)

Pakistani's Opinion

I will be content with this part of the Iranian friend's observations for understandable reasons. I will now move on to the observations of Ahmad al-Marudi, the secular brother, who has said:

"I cannot believe what I hear and see. It is as if I am seeing a film on the 12th century. I thought I was living in the center of the secular and material civilization and the stronghold of democracy until I heard them call the Pope 'his holiness.' We have rebelled against Islam, even though no individual is holy in Islam. Not even Muhammad, upon whom--the Muslims believe--an angel descended from heaven, is described as his holiness. The Muslims say: 'Only God is infallible.' There is no Muslim leader or clergyman who claims that he has performed a single miracle. When the Shaykh of al-Azhar, who was a sufist, said that he saw in his dream--and there is no restriction on dreams--the prophet of God crossing the Bar-lev line with the Egyptian army, the secularists and the progressives in the Arab world got enraged and accused the shaykh of believing in superstitions and of returning to the middle ages. They said there is no place for religion and for the metaphysical in the age of guided missiles and Phantom aircraft. In the United States, special places are set aside in every one of the Pope's meetings for the disabled and the sick who have come from all parts of the United States to wait for a miracle to cure them now that medicine in the most advanced country has failed to cure them. An announcer even asks New York's cardinal about the prerequisites for appointment to the cardinalship and the cardinal enumerates them, saying that they should include two miracles. The announcer, who had broadcast live the landing of the first U.S. citizen on the moon, then asks the cardinal without displaying any signs of doubt: What is your miracle? The cardinal answers very modestly: 'Curing a believer who had throat cancer!'

"I have been asking myself all this week: Are we the victim of a very malicious game from which we have emerged with neither missiles nor religion but with poverty and atheism whereas the others have preserved their religion and planted their flags on the moon?

"I was stunned to see the Pope dressed in more splendid clothes than those worn by any king, wearing a crown on his head and holding a scepter in his hand. The WASHINGTON POST was not wrong when it said that Rome's church has preserved the traditions and message of the Roman Empire and of the imperial court. The name of the Vatican Government is the Curia, which is the same as that of the Roman court or of the Roman Senate building. The title Pontifex used to mean the high priest in the Roman empire. This title has now turned into the Pontiff" (the Great Bishop, as we the Arabs say).

The Pakistani brother's message goes on to say: "The west is still in love with the emperor god and what I have seen during the Pope's visit makes me reassess all that I have learned on the hands of western professors and what I have read in the materialistic secular books.

"Who would have believed that Rosalyn Carter would say: 'You have come to us as an example of the vision that unites mankind—the vision of our Creator.' Are we the only ones who have renounced our Creator?

"Who would have believed that Edward Kennedy, the candidate for the presidency of the biggest industrial country in the world, would kneel before the Pope to receive his blessing? As for Frank Rizzo, Philadelphia's mayor, he knelt on one of his knees until his head almost touched the Pope's knee to receive his blessing. Rizzo's picture has been published in all the papers and has been considered a propaganda in his favor in the face of the campaign [investigation] conducted against him by the Attorney General's office on the charge of brutality against colored people?!

"As soon as the nun awaiting the Pope's arrival received the Pope's cap, she started kissing it and got so deeply absorbed kissing it that she did not realize that his holiness himself had arrived!

"At Yankee Stadium, the 80,000 Americans went on cheering, chanting and praying for 7 hours while waiting for the Pope's procession. When he arrived, they became frenzied and stretched their necks. They envied those in the front seats because they could touch the extremities of the Pope's retinue! The prominent cardinals and bishops, each with his specially colored cummerbund to indicate his rank in the church court, were bowing before the Pope, removing his crown and putting on his head the small cap [yarmulke] worn by the Jews. But this cap was white one time, red another and purple most of the time. They then attired him in special clothes similar to those of doctors in operation rooms. When Reverend Donald Hanson sweated, the Pope wiped his forehead and the journalists and photographers rushed to ask the man about his feelings about this gesture and about what

the Pope had told him. Hanson said that he was amazed and felt so ecstatic when the Pope's hand touched his forehead that he forgot whatever words were exchanged between himself and the Pope!

"The cardinal or bishop of New York moves toward the Pope with the censer which I thought had disappeared from the west and only remained in use in the religious ceremonies of the backward dervishes in our countries. The Pope holds the frankincense in his hand and gives the signal to incense the altar to expel the devils and the evil spirits that may be hiding inside it, even though the criminal and general intelligence men and the Vatican guard had examined the altar with electronic equipment and with dogs trained to discover bombs and explosives, but that cannot discover devils! (Our apologies to AL-HAWADITH readers. This is the opinion of a secularist who does not believe in religions, even though his fanaticism is obvious).

"After incensing, the prayers began. I was astonished by the number of New York youths who have memorized the prayers. If a test were given to the youth of Karachi, Cairo or Damascus on al-Fatihah chapter of the Quran, the majority of them would fail the test. The ceremonies continue and they bring the bread and the wine to the altar. Two bishops carrying an open bible approach the Pope and stand next to him while the Pope reads some phrases without touching the book. The parish representatives then read paragraphs from the Book of Genesis and the masses sing hymns after each reading. Meanwhile, the Pope moves his hand, making the sign of the cross. The New York masses shout with joy for the blessing received. Sorrow appears in the voices and eyes of those sitting in the upper tier because they are outside the circle of blessing. The Pope's compassion extends to them and he raises his scepter, which is almost 2 meters long, upward so that flashes of blessing may touch them and they cheer and express their thanks.

"The colors, the red carpets, the clothes and the altar cost 400,000 dollars and none of them signifies in the least the simplicity of Him who was born in a manger or the fisherman, whose 264th successor the Pope has declared himself.

"The prayers were completed and silence prevailed. The Pope closed his eyes, waiting for the solutions.

"The Pope opens his eyes, the solutions are received and everybody shouts: Hallelujah. The Pope rose, held a small loaf of bread and waved it to the masses. The lights were turned on the cameras focused on the small loaf of bread in the Pope's hand which looked as if it had turned into a rock from Mars or into an atomic bomb! Then the communion started!

"Twenty five persons had already been selected to receive their communion from the Pope personally and to enter history. These people are entitled to wear a blue flower in their buttonholes for life and the flower can be

inherited. Four hundred priests had also been delegated to give holy communion to the 80,000 people. The rule in holy communion is that the priest personally put the bread in the believer's mouth. However, the churches of the United States have permitted the believer to take the communion bread from the priest's hand and insert it in his mouth by himself. This has been considered a revolutionary reform and a compromise with the Americans obsessed by sanitation, especially since doctors had warned that an infection could be spread with the priest's hand moving from one mouth to another. But I have noticed this time that the people were eager to get the communion bread directly inserted in their mouths, perhaps because of the special occasion.

"It is well-known that all the efforts exerted to include married clergymen or women in these ceremonies had failed. The Pope declared in clear terms his rejection of the demand raised in the church for years to permit nuns to serve the lord in the clergymen's ranks [presumably conduct mass and other religious services]. It is well-known that there are in the United States 154,000 nuns looking for equality with the priests. Only 50 of them, i.e., one in every 3,000 have dared declare the demand and to protest politely the Pope's position. Those 50 nuns stood during the Pope's speech with bands around their arms, and only after a nightlong vigil of prayers. But the Pope insisted that the ministry is the work of men and that God has chosen man for this vocation. Had God wanted women to be equal with men, Christ would not have come in the image of man!

"Clare Randall, the general secretary of the National Council of Churches, has said: 'The Pope has stated that a woman cannot become a priestess. Insofar as his holiness is concerned, the Pope has asserted that women cannot have the same relationship with God as men. Else, couldn't God have used women the same way he uses men?'

"A woman colleague at the university asked me--the Pakistani friend says--for my opinion and I said: If there is a vocation in which equality between man and woman should be achieved, it is the vocation of serving God in the ministry because both men and women lose their distinguishing characteristics and turn into beings above male and female when they sacrifice the strongest instinct, rather the greatest blessing bestowed upon them by nature (this is the Pakistani's opinion)--namely the instinct of asserting their maleness or femaleness by engaging in sex. She asked me about Islam's position and I remembered my Iranian friend and his mistrust of the U.S. media. I said: You pay too much attention to the Muslim woman and I remember some of what has been written on whether the Iranian constitution provides for the right of a woman to hold the position of president of the republic. However, I have not read a single comment on the Pope's speech in Ireland where he said that the woman's place is in the house to give birth to children and raise them. The Pope also said: 'Do not heed those who tell you that work or success in any job is stronger than the response to the voice of the instinct to give life and to care for this life.' I haven't read any

comments on his words: 'A woman must obey and believe, exactly as the Holy Virgin obeyed and believed the angel Gabriel.' I said (the Pakistani goes on to say): In all of the Pope's tours, I have found the women to be modestly dressed, with hems below the knee and with arm-long sleeves. It is well-known that a woman is not allowed to meet the Pope with a bare head. Golda Meir's anecdote is well-known. She was to meet the Pope but had no cap and she refused to buy one from Rome so as not to squander Israel's hard currency assets. So she asked El Al to bring her an old cap from her home in Jerusalem on its first trip. Had she not covered her head, Meir would not have been able to see the Pope and the historical meeting would not have taken place. So, why all this uproar over the shadur [Iranian women's national dress]?

"I asked my woman friend who is a university professor: Which is harder on a woman: to wear a veil or to be denied her femininity as a wife and a mother? Why are you interested in the west in the sexual freedom of the Muslim woman while you fail to object to banning sex finally to 150,000 women in the United States alone and to no less than 15 million women in the world? The only thing she was able to give in the way of a reply was that the second case occurs with the woman's choice and volition. I told her: But freedom does not happen once. There has to be the right to reconsideration. The Pope refuses to absolve any priest or run of their vows. Contrary to Pope Paul VI who absolved 20,000 people, Pope John Paul II has not approved a single request so far. He has even said that the ministry is an eternal choice. He stated this in Latin for stress: Tu es Sacerdos Aeternum. 'We do not return God's gift. God who has said yes does not like to hear no....'"

Going on with his observations, the Pakistani friend says:

"I am astonished that the Pope has instructed the U.S. society with the teachings of Paul who died 20 centuries ago. The Pope has prohibited pre-marital sex and birth control and has banned divorce 'because the marriage of a Christian man and a Christian woman is eternal and irrevocable, as God's love is irrevocable.' He has also prohibited abortion. 'We speak in God's name, we who set the restrictions of the Christian law according to the divine right. Saint Paul has explained the relationship between justice and the truth.' The Pope has also said: 'All values, morals and liberties must obey and be bound to the teachings of the church.'

"I asked: How can Saint Paul's teachings be fit for a society that has invaded space and built skyscrapers--and the Pope pleased his audience when he mentioned the word for skyscraper in the nine languages that he knows--and now the teachings of the Koran, the prophet Muhammad and of the caliphs who founded a state and managed a multi-national society extending from ocean to ocean, keeping in mind that Saint Paul carried no political or social responsibility, did not even have a family and met a grievous end at the hands of Rome's tyrants who crucified him with his head hanging down? How can his teachings be fit to guide the American society and not the teachings of the caliphs for the Pakistani society which still lives in the 10th century?

"Why is our religion the only backward religion?

"How can the NEW YORK TIMES emerge with a title saying "The Ethics of Copulation" and then cite under it the Pope's opinion of the sex act and then we refuse to have our shaykhs speak, even though they permit divorce and birth control and say there is no ministry in Islam and even though the reality is closer to the opinion of our shaykhs? A survey conducted by the N.B.C. showed that 66 percent of the Catholics support the use of birth control means, 63 percent support the right to divorce and 53 percent believe that a clergyman should be permitted to get married.

"I have thought a lot of the sly method to which the NEW YORK TIMES (5 October 1979) resorted. On that day, the paper was abounding with reports of the papal position toward women. Then without any occasion, it selected this day to publish an article by Christopher Warren dealing with the chapter of the "Green Book" concerning women and menstruation and the impossibility of equalizing women with men and stressing that this is the opinion of Islam."

Many things have caught my attention and big questions are revolving in my mind but I prefer to postpone them until the view becomes clear. What I would like to stress is that I do not agree with the Iranian brother on beating the drums of crusades. I believe the papal rise reflects a more serious historical development, namely Europe's return to the international arena after an absence of more than 20 years--a united Europe aspiring for an international role, especially in the Middle East, Africa and Latin America. Catholicism is Europe and Rome is Europe's spiritual capital when the latter moves against the Arabs. Rome is the city that subjugated the Middle East to the first pre-Christian empire. The Vatican has inherited Rome's throne. The Arabs are the ones who eliminated Rome's control, or half of this control, over the eastern Mediterranean, who blockaded Christianity in Central Europe and who beat the Europeans to Asia and Africa. The Vatican's Rome is the city that United Europe against the east a second time during the Crusades which, though failing to subjugate the east, formed the beginning of the European renaissance which re-imposed European control over the eastern Mediterranean. The church is the side that organized the expulsion of the Arabs from Andalusia (Spain and Portugal) to be replaced by the European bloc most strongly tied to the Vatican until the present. The heirs to Andalusia are the ones who carried Catholicism to Latin America. The third round between Europe and the Middle East ended with Europe's victory, with subjugating the entire east to Europe's control and with Europe gaining control over the new world and introducing this world to its religion and its civilization.

The United States has been able to oust Europe from the Middle East and Asia and then from Africa. Europe, which was divided and crushed by the war, succumbed to the ouster. But in 20 years, Europe has united in the Common Market and Britain, which always eschewed its European (affiliation), has

been compelled, with its independent church, to return to the European fold. It is rumored that Britain's crown prince is in love with a Catholic girl and wants to change the constitution so as to eliminate the restrictions imposed on the Catholics. Whoever wants Europe must learn to coexist with the Catholics.

The united Europe is the strongest economic power in the world at present in terms of stability and growth rate. Europe is the closest to the Middle East, is the most experienced in its affairs and has the deepest roots and connections in it. Europe was united only twice before: Once under the Rome of the caesars and once under the banners of Pope Urban II. This is the third time. When Europe unites, it turns its attention toward the eastern and southern Mediterranean. The Europeans are telling the Americans: You have failed to replace us. The Soviets are grabbing the Middle East away from both you and us or are creating chaos and sedition in it. Hand over the Middle East to us and we will run it for the benefit of the advanced world. We will give the Soviets their share and give you your share and prevent friction between Washington and Moscow. Otherwise, we will build our nuclear power and will act in our interest, even if by way of reconciliation with the Soviets. Perhaps Brezhnev's initiative [withdrawing troops and tanks from East Germany] is intended to encourage this inclination and to reduce the importance of the U.S. protection.

The U.S.-European confrontation over oil and the Middle East crisis is well-known. The latest demonstration is Europe's rejection of the Camp David accords, or the U.S. settlement. This is the position that the European Pope has also taken--namely the position of expressing reservation on the agreement and demanding a comprehensive settlement. It was no coincidence that the Middle East got the longest paragraph in the Pope's speech to the United Nations. This is because the Middle East is Europe's quest and its urgent issue.

The Pope is Europe's spiritual leadership and he has come to the United States to display his blessings and his muscle and to demand a mandate for a European movement. Will he get such a mandate?

I will be content with this much for this week and we shall meet again.

Chief Editor's, Farran's Responses

London AL-HAWADITH in Arabic 2 Nov 79 p 17

[Text] Should the editorial management scratch out any paragraphs from an article by one of its prominent writers?

The question was presented at a meeting when an article by Jalal Kishk entitled "Has Confrontation Between Christian West and Muslim East Started?" was received from Washington. This is the article that was published in

the last edition and that has created sharp reactions among various circles. The article contained a violent opinion against the political movement of His Holiness John Paul II. In the article, the writer adopted the view of the communists and the leftists on this movement. This is a popular view in the European and American papers and magazines, some of which have said that the U.S. intelligence killed Pope John Paul I to bring in the Polish Pope so that he may lead a crusade against atheism. But Jalal Kishk has surpassed all the world's atheists with his distrust of the Pope's movement. He has added to the sentiments of these atheists his own feelings as a man from Upper Egypt who is fraught with the memories of the feud between the Muslims and the Copts. He has added to all this the Muslim Brotherhood's view on issues pertaining to the essence of Christian theology. According to one of the editors opposed to publishing the article altogether, Kishk measures the statements of Christ's heir on earth with the yardsticks of those most fanatically opposed to Christianity.

It is Jalal Kishk's opinion that as long as His Holiness the Pope acts as a political leader, then it is the right of all people, even if they are Jews and Mazdaists, to evaluate his works and acts. This opinion could have been acceptable had Kishk not gotten everything mixed up, i.e. had he not overstepped the bounds of criticizing the Pope's political movement and reached the point of ridiculing religious rites which he, and his opinion, would have done better to leave out of the article. But the majority of the colleagues, especially the Christians among them, demanded that Jalal Kishk's article be published in full so that if there is anything concealed in the hearts it may come out in the open and may be easy to answer. It was the opinion of these editors that secrecy is harmful in such issues. Kishk is one of hundreds of thousands in the Arab and Islamic worlds. So let us hear his opinion and then answer him.

In fact, as soon as Kishk's article was published we sensed the presence of an intense rage against the article and its writer and a strong desire to answer it.

The contradiction into which Kishk has fallen is that he has given himself surprising liberty in discussing beliefs while launching a campaign against the west. He has not acted as an easterner in respecting religious beliefs and rites while imagining that he was defending the east. Kishk should have either taken the freedom of the west and lauded the western civilization that acknowledges freedom or he should have adhered to his easternism and clung to the bounds of its traditions.

The mistake that we, as an editorial management, have committed is that we have considered ourselves like the U.S. TIME magazine which published in 1970 a cover bearing the single phrase "Has God Died?" and like the London theater which has been showing the play "Jesus Christ Superstar" for 10 years and which is still showing this play.

We must admit that we did not think that publishing the article was a mistake until we started receiving the responses which have made us doubt the soundness of our view.

The discussion is open and this is only the beginning.

Chief Editor

The reader is perplexed by Jalal Kishk's article on the confrontation between the Christian west and the Muslim east. Which of the two characteristics of the article is more serious: Its fanaticism and ignorance or its ill intentions? Perhaps the only virtue of the article is that it has been published in the west where the writer has exploited the west's freedom to the maximum to say things about this west which would have gotten him to charge corruption in the world had he said them about Islam in the east where he would find a million Khalkhali and Zia-ul-Haq ready to drink his blood.

It is fortunate that the writer did not find an Arab professor to express his view along with that of the "faithful" Iranian professor Hasan Shari'ati-zaden and of the atheist Pakistani professor Ahmad al-Marudi because the faith of the Arabs, by virtue of their being the founders of Islam, cannot turn into atheism and hypocrisy unless such Arabs are professors in western universities.

The logical flaw in Jalal Kishk's article is that the writer uses both summer and winter under the same roof and judges the same issue with two conflicting yardsticks. The writer has permitted himself to wonder how people in the Christian west still cling to ancient and "paganistic" rites despite their vast scientific and technological progress whereas he finds nothing wrong in the fact that all the knowledge and technology that the Iranian and Pakistani professors imbibed in the west have not penetrated the surface of their minds. Moreover, the writer has permitted himself to portray the confrontation between the west and the east, which is a confrontation that is older than Christianity and Islam, as a confrontation between the Christians and the Muslims.

Finally, Kishk has permitted himself to encroach on the essence of Christianity and of the Christian faith whereas he has said nothing about the message of Pope John Paul II which has been received with hostility by millions of the faithful Christians themselves. What is in Jalal Kishk's article is directed against Christianity and the Christians and not against the Pope and the Vatican. There are many Christian writers and intellectuals who view the Pope's message as reactionary and who believe that the Pope has closed the door in the face of the religious and social reform begun by the Catholic Church under his predecessors, which is the fundamental issue. The Pope has thus put "support for religion" above religious reform. This is a purely political position emanating from the fact that the present pope

belongs to a country ruled officially by atheism. The immediate confrontation in this country is between the regime and the church. We would not be exaggerating if we say that the progressive Christians in the west view the present pope as more of an "eastern Muslim" than a western Christian.

But this is something and the essence of Christianity and of the Christian faith is something else. We do not think that anybody in the Christian west or the Muslim east will permit himself to talk about Ayatollah Khomeyni and Islam with the convoluted logic which Jalal Kishk has permitted himself to use in talking about the pope and Christianity. We find many in both the east and the west who criticize Khomeyni's policy, actions and views but we find none who attack the essence of Islam or of the Islamic faith, even though Khomeyni has turned the Iranian city of Qom to something that looks like an Islamic Vatican and has entrenched the clergy by giving the clergy-men the power to dominate people. This is what the Christians in the west have renounced since the middle ages.

We have not found any of those who criticize Khomeyni and his views permitting themselves to ridicule the Muslim rites of touring the Ka'bah, of praying prostrated, of watching for the Ramadan crescents on a rainy and cloudy night when science can determine the time of the crescent's appearance right down to the minute and the second and other rites, customs, traditions and symbols.

Despite the scenes and the practices that Jalal Kishk has described in his article, the west, which he has called the "Christian west," is still predominated by the secular tendency. This is definitely no secret to Kishk who pretends to be a secularist in attacking the west but immediately sheds away this quality when projecting the views of the two Muslim professors, disavowing this secularity to the degree whereby he brings the atheist Pakistani back to his religion!

Though it is natural for the pope's visit to any country to receive such enthusiasm as that which the writer describes as close to hysteria, it is not at all true that this phenomenon is employed to overshadow Khomeyni or to obliterate him at the level of the media. Moreover, Pope Paul VI, the present pope's predecessor, received similar, and even greater, enthusiasm on his trips and all this happened before the emergence of Khomeyni.

The question that Kishk asks through his Iranian friend—namely: Are we the victim of an extremely malicious game from which we have emerged with neither missiles nor religion but with poverty and atheism whereas the others have preserved their religion and planted their flags on the moon?—intimates that the Christian world is the cause of the Islamic world's backwardness. It is true that the west is largely responsible for the east's backwardness because of its colonization of the east for a long period. But this is a political, economic and military issue. Even the Crusades with their religious characteristic are included within this sphere. The political,

economic and military west responsible for the backwardness of the Islamic east is also responsible by the same degree for the backwardness of vast Christian countries comprising a continent in its entirety, namely the Catholic and Latin South America.

But an important part of the east's backwardness is the responsibility of the east itself. Why hasn't Kishk discussed this aspect? Why hasn't he wondered about the absence of the democracy and the public liberties which he has used to write in the west whatever he has written about the west-- why hasn't Kishk wondered about the absence of this democracy and of these liberties in all the eastern Islamic countries?

This response does not emanate from a Christian faith, and this is a personal matter. Neither does the response emanate from a desire to defend the west where Christianity is only one out of many dimensions, even though it is a broader and more comprehensive dimension than others. This response emanates from the eagerness for the Islamic east's progress and liberation, especially the Arab East where Islam has a meaning different from that prevailing in the other non-Arab Islamic countries. The Christian Arabs or the Christians who live in the Arab East and who are bound to Arabism and Islam by stronger cultural and intellectual ties than those that bind them to the Christian west, despite all the old and new attempts to break these ties to Arabism and Islam, can only understand what Jalal Kishk has written as one of these attempts, even if he has different intentions.

Even if we acknowledge for the sake of argument that the Christian west and the Islamic east are in a conflict and that Islam and Christianity cannot meet and cannot coexist, in the current confrontation in the east a confrontation between Christians and Muslims or one between Christianity and Islam?

If this is the situation, then the answer is known in advance, namely that the outcome of this confrontation will be in the interest of a third party. But we don't believe that Jalal Kishk meant to end up with this conclusion intentionally. All the same, he has done so.

Dr George Farran

Father George Rahmah's Response

London AL-HAWADITH in Arabic 16 Nov 79 p 70

[Text] The article "Confrontation Between the Christian West and Muslim East" has angered a number of writers, thinkers and intellectuals. It is natural that the interpretations and the responses would be different. Some have expressed the belief that Jalal Kishk used the pope as a cover to criticize Christianity in an unobjective and unscientific manner whereas others have found the article interesting and worthy of discussion. AL-HAWADITH opens its pages for the expression of every opinion, provided that it is compatible with the rules of dialogue and of clear debate and that it is free of slander and insinuation, especially on such a sensitive subject that deals with beliefs.

[Father Rahmah] AL-HAWADITH has accustomed us at times, especially since the eruption of the Lebanese-Palestinian war and the Lebanese-Syrian war, to a degree of objectivity or the so-called realistic and scientific analysis of events. We were the first to welcome this step, implemented by a "Lebanese" information medium with wide circulation.

We believe that Salim al-Lawzi, AL-HAWADITH owner and its chief editor, understands perfectly well what we mean by our statement. But what is surprising is that AL-HAWADITH has suddenly resumed the inciting "Lebanese" and Arab method of information that was followed in the past and that contributed decisively toward losing most of the rightful Lebanese and Arab causes.

In its edition No 1199 of Friday, 26 October 1979, AL-HAWADITH stunned us by a rude and tendentious article written by Jalal Kishk under the title of "Has Confrontation Between Christian West and Muslim East Started?"

To start with, we would have liked to consider the title an inlet to a scientific spiritual-ideological analysis, because we respect the beliefs of the others, but we found instead that the article contains from the outset a tendency to incite the instincts—a tendency for which this is not the time. We were amazed how the chief editor of AL-HAWADITH who is well-known for his objectivity could have permitted the publication of this article at a time in which the Lebanese, not to mention their spiritual and secular leaderships, are seeking to realize real national detente?

Our amazement was not diminished by the introduction with which the writer presented his published "thesis" and in which he said: "AL-HAWADITH is generally perceived as a paper that publishes whatever information it receives and whatever ideas fit for reading occur to the minds of its editors...."

Before answering AL-HAWADITH and the article writer, we would like to assure Kishk that this justification is not enough and that it is tantamount to an endeavor to escape censure for passing and disseminating malicious ideas through a plan with which Kishk may be better familiarized than ourselves.

We are aware that meeting with God is an act of revelation whose theological dimensions cannot be comprehended except with a blessing from God who lights the way for our minds to understand the spiritual values and to live with true faith in God and with constant sacrifice for the sake of our fellowman.

The universe in God's creation and man, the image of God, cannot rise to the level of the message unless he works with matter itself and spiritualizes it so that it becomes a clear reflection of his self-sacrifice and of the universal sacrifice that allows our human nature to mix with the divine nature towards which God, with His blessings, has urged us. This awareness cannot be actually realized except through man himself to whom the qualities of divinity are revealed when he is open to himself and to the others more strongly. The first example of Our Lord Jesus Christ was this openness to the entire world, considering that His sacrifice for mankind was not intended for the salvation of a certain group of people but for all mankind, even men who do not deserve it.

This is why it is a great honor given to very few people to rise to the level of sacrifice and to understand that the death of Him who was crucified on a wooden cross was intended to turn the hearts of men into gold. The blessing has been given to all men but, unfortunately, many of them have refused and continue to refuse this blessing. The symbol has become to some people the "trickery of clowns and participation in the communion of salvation has become an instigation to shed the blood of enemies."

We are aware that man is the enemy of that which he does not know. This is why the article has fallen short of the scientific standard required by the modern and correct media. The article has come as instigation and as a plot against the sanctity of our religion and against the most sublime spiritual personality in the world. This is something that we reject utterly because the sanctity of faith should not be a commodity in the hands of those who live under a malicious state of ignorance in the age of light, of giving and of freedom, especially since the second Vatican synod has urged all those who believe in God, regardless of what religion they belong to, to stand like a firm barrier in the face of rising atheism. We were disappointed when we read the article of AL-HAWADITH's Kishk because we would have sincerely liked to maintain some of our respect for this paper.

We would have also liked to refrain from descending to the level of the article writer who has exposed his utter lack of spirituality and morality and who has described others, who are the superior ones in this world, as reactionaries, thus proving and confirming irrefutably that he is a reactionary, rather than that he is specialized in spreading false and reactionary atheism. In his article which smells strongly of lackeyhood, the writer has used criticisms and phrases forgotten by time and not at all pertaining to scientific thinking. Had he had any objective scientific thinking, it would have behooved him to present to us new criticisms emanating sincerely from either his fanaticism or his atheism, it doesn't matter which. But, unfortunately, he has proven that he is the voice of past masters whose ideas are outworn and obsolete and no longer have any connection with modern life.

If this Kishk were a scientist, he would have the right to discuss science. If he were a thinker, he would have the right to offer us his views on the pages of AL-HAWADITH or others. Were he a theologian, we would permit him to debate theological matters with us. This is why (Pasquel) says: "Only God speaks about God." Kishk is not a scientist, a thinker or a theologian. He is not even a journalist though he has published his article as a journalist interested in AL-HAWADITH.

Kishk's citing of two "professors," one Iranian and the other Pakistani, and his using them as a means to hide himself and his master--whom, it seems obvious, is returning to the "war of retrogression"--does not mean that we hold many of the educated Muslims in Lebanon and in the world--Muslims who, we imagine, have been as disgusted with his article as we have--

responsible for the two opinions. It also seems that the owner of AL-HAWADITH welcomed this article and gave its title a prominent place on the cover of his magazine because of the reactionary, chauvinistic, ignorant and reactionary opinions it contains.

AL-HAWADITH owner is aware, we think, that the hard currency that flows these days from well-known sources abroad to the agents and the spies does not justify such inflammatory articles which, regardless of how numerous, cannot touch the Christian values through their representatives, led by His Holiness Pope John Paul II who lives the teachings and instructions of Christ and who urges us to love our enemies and to be tolerant toward them despite the thousands of Christian martyrs who have fallen on our land.

Moreover, His Holiness the Pope requires us, in our homeland and in the entire world, to achieve peace and social justice, to secure human rights and to spread love in the hearts of both the friends and the enemies so that we may create a new world dominated by justice, freedom and equality.

On the issue of the Christian symbol, AL-HAWADITH's Kishk says: "Were they really to eat and drink, then their behavior would be understandable. But for the elite in the western world to believe that with the blessing of a man bread turns into Christ's body and wine into His blood and then to consume them with happiness, isn't this the basis of the civilization's brutality? If they drink the blood of Him whom they love and who sacrificed for their sake, then what will they do to their enemies?" We will not answer this statement because only the sons of blessing have been given the power to probe the depths of the divine nature. Our concerns as true Lebanese and as internationalist Christians go far beyond such articles and hallucinations which prove that the writer is suffering from various complexes, including the complex of the Crusades--crusades which the comprehensive thinking of His Holiness Pope John Paul II, who is concerned with all the people of the world, never entertains.

Once again, this is what indicates the reactionary character of AL-HAWADITH's Kishk and the others like him. This characteristic has turned Kishk into a complicated man whose thought is void of any traces of development, of the future and of history.

Finally, we are content to say that love alone builds and that hatred destroys. We are from a Lebanese school of information that knows perfectly well how the sound building should be and that adheres to the objective word as a noble and sacred slogan. Our criticism of Kishk is nothing but an expression of our love and our wish that he would seek the sources of sound thinking carefully and would aspire for human, national and informational ethics. We hope that Kishk and others will not compel us to resort to harsher replies.

Ultimately, civilization is not a group of Kishks hanging onto the "modern" state of ignorance [as opposed to pre-Islamic state of ignorance] extending from the ocean to the Gulf. Civilization consists of a number of bright, rare and immortal values that the Kishks can only find in the spiritual and human resources that they are proceeding to fight and to criticize with the mentality of dwarfs.

Ultimately, what remains is the love which we urge Kishk and his likes to adhere to—a love that may cure them, perhaps gradually, of their sicknesses and their insurmountable sectarian complexes. This is a part of our message in this world which is full of Kishks and people like them and which is also full of love, joy and happiness.

Reverend Dr George Rahmah
From the Lebanese Newspaper AL-'AMAL

Dr Taysir Kawwa's Criticism

London AL-HAWADITH in Arabic 16 Nov 79 pp 75-76

[Text] I read in AL-HAWADITH edition of 26 October 1979 an article by Jalal Kishk, your correspondent in the United States, on the pope's visit to that country. My comment on what Kishk has written is divided into a comment on the form and comment on the substance.

It is my opinion that the title published on the cover of the magazine has not reflected all the contents of Kishk's article and is, therefore, subject to the charge that it is a title intended for provocation and sensationalism or for selling the magazine.

In the light of what is happening in the Arab world, and especially in Lebanon, this question-like title is an evil instigation. Page 44 of the magazine carries a picture of a U.S. policeman kissing the pope's hand while kneeling and above the picture there is the caption: "U.S. security kisses his hand for blessing." Has it come to the point where a single U.S. policeman represents the U.S. security? Is this what is called these days calm and responsible journalism? Moreover, I would like to ask Kishk about the language with which he communicated with his two atheist Iranian and Pakistani friends (considering that he is only the transmitter of atheism) and about the nature of his article. Is it a dialogue between himself and two other persons and who are these two persons. Or does his article transmit opinions which he and his friends discussed at a social get-together one evening and with which Kishk, with his journalistic perspecacity, decided to present to the readers before the gems that they had discussed could be lost in the fog of thought and in the folds and memories of nights?

This is all insofar as the form is concerned. As for the substance, I believe that there is no difference between what Jalal Kishk's two friends said and what Kishk has transmitted, citing his two friends. The outcome is the same, namely that issues have been brought up what would have been better left alone by a political weekly magazine--rather it is the duty of journalistic integrity, honesty and responsibility not to bring up such issues in such a manner. Kishk's article consists of a number of intellectual flights, rude opinions and illusions attired in the garb of "facts" and supported by neither science nor historical facts.

Perhaps the propagation of these views in recent times constitutes one of the most painful catastrophes of the Islamic world--a world whose view the article seems to be defending. It seems to me that what has ruined Lebanon, which is in the Islamic world, is the multiplicity and abundance of this kind of view, i.e. the views founded basically on myths, superstitions and delusions. To be fair to Kishk and to his informers, the source of these views in the past two generations has not been confined to fanatic Iranians or Pakistani atheists nor to the students of intermediate schools. There are establishments calling themselves universities that have produced this kind of mentality and that have expressed views and opinions not much different from what we have read in this article.

Kishk says that he sent this unfriendly letter about the pope's visit. Whom does he mean to deprive of his dear friendship? To whom does this man write? From whom does he get the inspiration for his writings?

This article is full of flights of the imagination and of judgments that are supported by neither science, reality or history. You want examples? Here are some examples. Who said that the fiercest wars are the wars waged in the name of religion? Who said that the most ferocious of wars were declared in the name of religion? The wars that broke out among the Christians, even at the peak of the so-called Crusades, and the wars that erupted among the Christians in Europe itself, in Asia, in Africa and in the two Americas were a lot more ferocious than the wars that the Muslims waged against the Christians. Moreover, the wars, the severance of heads and the plots carried out by Muslims against other Muslims were, and continue to be, more ferocious than what happened between the Muslims and the Christians. Do you have any doubts? Then ask the serious men of learning and researchers and not correspondents of the caliber of Kishk and not his friend, the electronics professor. Ask those who know and they will give you the definite answer. Wars, Crusades or other wars, are not determined by one factor but by several factors. The declared cause of a war is rarely the most important cause. The most violent war in this century started because of the assassination of a Christian prince in a Christian European country on the hands of a Christian European youth. This is what has been said. Examine, Mr Kishk, the history that they taught you in elementary schools, that is if you have graduated from an elementary school. Examine history to learn the background of wars.

The article insinuates that the Catholic church, the representative of the Christian west, is trying to assume the leading role in attacking the Muslim east or that the church is capable of polarizing the west or is, in fact, in the process of polarizing the Christian west to prepare for war against the Muslim east. Since its foundation and until this moment, the Catholic church has not stopped trying to lead or to resume a leadership role whose sweetness this church tasted in past ages. There is no doubt that the Catholic church is an international religious organization primarily. But it has been trying for long ages to resume the political status that it enjoyed at one time. The outcome of the desperate attempts is that the church has not yet succeeded in leading any of the west's movements and has not been able to do more than provide some social services. The latest reports are that the church was not able to rally more than 100,000 people at Yankee Stadium and places other than Yankee Stadium. The American crowds that received the pope do not amount to even 0.5 percent of the U.S. population. When the pope was in Ireland, he asked the Irish to try to coexist peacefully but as soon as he left Ireland the war situation returned to what it had been before his arrival. In the United States, and it behooves Mr Kishk to inform his Iranian friend Hasan Bey of this, the N.B.C. has provided statistics indicating that "66 percent of the Catholics support the use of birth control means, 63 percent of them support the freedom of divorce and 53 percent believe in the need to permit priests to get married." This means that the majority of the Catholics who applauded the pope, rejoiced at his presence, cheered for his long life and kissed the hem of his robes oppose the teachings of the Catholic church which is represented by the pope, i.e. the pope who is "Europe's spiritual leadership" (and I don't understand what this word means in this position)—the pope who came to the United States to display his blessings and his muscle and to demand a commission for the European movement. Muscles, really!! Sir, the Catholic church, like any international establishment, has certain beliefs and it has not, is not and will not (and this is the church's right, even its duty) stop trying to project itself as the solution to the human problems, tragedies, catastrophes and crises. Like any international organization with its followers and supporters, political and non-political organizations and veteran and amateur politicians will try to exploit the church, if possible, and to use it as an instrument as they are exploiting religion itself and using it as an instrument. Kennedy who knelt before the pope, that is if he did actually kneel, may have done so because he is a believer and he will have thus done what a faithful Muslim does when he prostrates himself on the floor [to pray because each religion, and each religious person, has its way of expressing its religious feelings and beliefs, or Kennedy may have knelt, and this is more likely, being certain that the eyes of the U.S. Catholics were focused on him to find out the degree of his respect for the establishments and their representatives and the degree of his respect for the Catholic church in particular. But for us to consider what Kennedy and others did [during the pope's visit] as if it were the start of an offensive Christian western campaign against a Muslim east is naive, unrealistic, ridiculous and shortsighted. No wars, Crusades or otherwise,

will occur unless the same social, economic and psychological factors existing when Europe launched its first Crusades and its other wars come into existence again. If new east-west wars erupt, then only those who are blind and tendentious will call them crusades. The west does not fight in the name of religion or of the cross but exploits the cross, if possible, in any of its wars. This has happened in the Christian Europe, in Korea, in Vietnam, in Palestine and in Africa. It is said that the Americans did not respond to Camille Sham'un's appeals to rescue Lebanon in 1958, even though they were aware that Lebanon's rulers at the time were appealing to Christianity and ruling in the name of protecting this Christianity. The Americans did not land their troops on Lebanon's shores until 'Abd-al-Karim Qasim's coup was staged in Iraq. The United States of the religious Eisenhower landed its troops in Lebanon to defend its interests, out of fear for those interests from the influence of the communists and to prevent that influence from reaching the Mediterranean.

The Muslims, Mr Kishk, have started a war that will be more devastating and more ruinous than what you and your friends want to revive, i.e. the memories of the Crusades. How? Let me tell you. The pope is Polish and Poland is ruled by the communists. The pope greeted the Jews in the United States, which is hostile to communism and most of whose affairs are controlled by the Jews, with the word Shalom. As far as I know, Poland and the Vatican have not fought Israel and neither has Israel fought them, so why blame them? The pope is Polish and the westerner with an ordinary education, and the pope seems to be one. does not pay as much attention to our problems as we, or our educated men, pay to the international problems. It is my opinion that the pope, with all my respect and appreciation, does not know much about the Palestinian tragedy yet. Leave these matters aside and tell me: Has the pope done more than Muhammad Anwar al-Sadat has done? Didn't al-Sadat send his Shalom to Begin in Jerusalem from the sanctuary of al-Azhar, one of the strongholds of Islam? Didn't al-Sadat and his Egyptian ministers shake the hand of the Israeli minister of defense when the latter's aircraft were pouring their lava and fire on the Muslims and the non-Muslims and desecrating the honor of Islam and of Arabism in a spot only 400 kilometers away and in a land considered part of the Muslim east?

Sir, the Catholic church has lost a great lot since it was at the peak of its strength and the pontiff is trying now, as his predecessors tried, to regain what was lost. But his dignity and the dignity of the church have compelled him to declare in his speeches in Ireland and the United States his determination to adhere to the church's fundamental beliefs. The church is looking for a role, for a task and for an important mission so that it may emerge as a state that wants more than the western world is willing to give it. They gave the pope the international Hyde Park (Corner) Podium, i.e. the U.N. podium. The outcome? Clamor, celebrations, emotions, tears of joy, fireworks, feasts and television pictures. And then what? Nothing. The pope came to the United States to get the blessing and not to give it. Perhaps he came to mediate and negotiate between the western and the communist

worlds. The western media have portrayed the event to the television-addicted world as if it were meant for the opposite. No, Mr Kishk, the westerners receive whomever they have an evident interest in receiving or receive whomever they deem as ready to be a vehicle for these interests, be he a Muslim easterner, a Christian easterner, a Christian westerner or whatever.

The manner in which the issue of the western civilization and of its current moral crisis has been presented in the article is, to say the least, primitive and emotional. I am referring here to the Pakistani Jalal Kishk. It seems that this man has looked only at what dazzled him in the western civilization. He has looked at the veneer and rushed toward what he calls atheism, as if the west is responsible for his atheism. This man does not know how to view the west and how to view religiousness and atheism. I doubt if his concept of morals is compatible with the west's concept of these issues. In the west, as well as in the east, and among the Christians, as well as among the Muslims, there is religiousness and religious people. Religiousness means (among other things) rites and customs. Each religion has its rites and its symbols, even atheism has its rites and symbols!! Human behavior has more rites and symbols than anything else. Even language itself is ultimately a bunch of symbols and rites. Taking the bread and the wine is a symbol and considering the bread and the wine a symbol of the blood and body of Christ of Nazareth is of the essence of the religious rites, the same way that the pilgrimage of no less than a million Muslims from all parts of the world every year to the venerable Mecca to kiss the Black Rock (among performing other duties and rites) is considered of the essence of Islam. The west has not abandoned its faith nor the rites that usually accompany faith (religious rites and symbols usually have psychological social functions which cannot be discussed now). However, the west has separated faith in the Creator and in religion from the establishments that manage the people's secular affairs, i.e. it has separated the church from the state. States in the west have resorted, like all states in various ages and under various crises, and especially under crises, to the people's common beliefs and have invoked and instigated these beliefs to create an intellectual current that gets the people prepared for certain work. But religion has not always been the thing invoked and religion has not always performed what is required. The state's use of psychological mobilization or instigation will not succeed in making people rush toward certain action unless specific social, economic and psychological conditions are in existence. What is happening in the west at present is to prepare the people for likely problems with the others. When the Russian communism was the main enemy of the west, the instigation, mobilization and psychological charging was directed against communism. Now the west is afraid that oil will stop flowing to it or that the Russians will get control of this oil and this is why the west is trying to mobilize the ordinary westerners and to prepare them for a battle with those who have the oil or with others who covet this oil. The west is doing this because it may have to fight these oil owners or those coveting the oil some day. Among the combatants fighting alongside the west, there will be Muslims—if developments continue in their present course.

No man, regardless of how powerful and tyrannical, can turn a Muslim into an atheist or a Christian. A Muslim is a Muslim with the faith in his heart, and so is the Christian. Confusing faith and religion with world affairs, with international affairs and with international political moves is extremely stupid and ignorant. It is easier for the American ruler to persuade the Americans to fight the Muslims or the Arabs than to persuade them to fight the European Christians, for example, for reasons that cannot be dwelt upon here. But we saw how in World War II the U.S. Christians fought the Christian Germans and the non-Christian Japanese! The hostility directed at the east is not against the Muslims but against the latent power represented by the capabilities of the east, the entire east with both its Muslims and its Christians. If crusades are being prepared by the Christian west against the Muslim east, then the first bullet in these crusades has already been fired. Muhammad Anwar al-Sadat and all the Muslims who support him secretly and openly, and they are many, have fired this bullet and the bullet has been fired at the Muslim east. The politicized Marunites in Lebanon who constitute a minority, even among the Christians with whom I have the honor of sharing Lebanon and its citizenship, would not have dared declare what is in their hearts in the hearts of other Muslim and Christians in Lebanon and in other parts if it had not been for the public support and example given by Muhammad Anwar al-Sadat and his secret supporters, and they are many.

The source of our catastrophes is still within us. The west does not want for us what the honorable and loyal among us want for us, and this is natural. The west does not want to lose what it possesses, and this is natural also. But we are losing what we possess with recklessness, ignorance, stupidity and with judgments not controlled by any logic, rationality or reason. The issues aroused by Jalal Kishk through his two friends are serious and complex and should not under any circumstances be discussed in this form and manner in a magazine that proclaims to be a political and informational weekly. The last column of Mr Kishk's article is nonsense. I beg you and the readers earnestly to re-read the contents of this article as of page 38, beginning with the words "the church moved" until the end of the article. This is drivel and not the words of a responsible journalist in an age that no longer permits us to confuse the issues, to clown and to engage in trickery. The most eloquent answer for what the west is preparing for us is that we prepare silently--prepare the hearts, the minds and the arms in a manner that gets them ready for a battle and not for a new demonstration and for vituperation and clamor. If the Iranian professor says that "the pope wanted to obliterate the traces of Khomeyni and Islam from the U.S. media" then believe him! Poor pope! Once upon a time he used to summon kings and crowns to his presence and now he is compelled to go to the United States to offer his services and to start the new Crusade from that remote place! No, sir. Khomeyni will continue to be in the U.S. media as long as he heads a state in which the west has vital interests. How we wish that enlightened minds and free pens would concentrate on analyzing what is happening on the international stage and analyzing the role that the Catholic church is attempting to perform on this stage in these hard times.

Mr Jalal Kishk's article contributes toward spreading ignorance and does not enlighten.

Father Kawkabani Responds to Jalal Kishk Article

London AL-HAWADITH in Arabic 23 Nov 79 p 69

[Article by Father Yuhanna Kawkabani: "Who Benefits From Defamation of Head of Only State That Hasn't Recognized Israel?"]

[Text] Responses to Jalal Kishk's article on "confrontation between Christian west and Muslim east" continue to come. AL-HAWADITH publishes in this issue the response of Father Yuhanna Kawkabani which he starts by saying:

The article writer and his two friends are free to be "fanatic and unfriendly" and to love the pope or hate him but they are not free to write what they have written. AL-HAWADITH is not free to publish and highlight in a special way what they have written about the Christian beliefs and sacraments with which they deal with such sarcasm and scorn that nobody has ever before dared to do in a Lebanese paper. We ask Salim al-Lawzi who knows that he has more readers and admirers among the Christians than among the Muslims: How can he condone the publication on the pages of his magazine of these primitive and fanatic views that are unfriendly toward both Christianity and toward the pope? Al-Lawzi is also perfectly aware that what has been published in this edition is punishable by law because it disparages Christianity and debases its rites and because it slanders and defames the head of the church. This entitles the people concerned to sue him in the courts and requires the public prosecution to move automatically to confiscate the edition and to pursue the article's writer and publisher. But the prosecution has not done so and we do not expect to do anything under the circumstances. As for the right to sue, this is up to the people concerned. However, we are eager for Mr Salim al-Lawzi to know that what he has published and highlighted in evident collusion will not undermine Christianity and the pope but rather harms his magazine and distorts the impression we had of AL-HAWADITH as a magazine characterized by objectivity and by intelligent daring that provokes skillfully without disparaging the dignity of the establishments or the individuals about whom it writes. But in this article, the magazine has fallen into cheap and unintelligent sensationalism. The naive, fanatic and unfriendly manner in which the three musketeers of this article have distorted the Christian rites and attacked the church and its head is, to say the least, shameful and unacceptable.

It is unacceptable that Salim al-Lawzi permit Jalal Kishk to transmit on the pages of his magazine and through the mouths of an Iranian whom Kishk describes as "fanatic as teenagers" and a Pakistani whom Kishk introduces to us as "an atheist secularist"—it is unacceptable that al-Lawzi permit Kishk to transmit observations which the writer himself admits are like those of "the blind who were asked to describe the elephant after each of them had touched a part of his body." This anecdote is well-known. However,

Kishk proceeds to say that "the picture with which each of us has emerged contains part of the truth (what truth?) or at least the impact of the visit on each of us...." This is exactly like the impact of light on a man blind in his eyes and in his heart. They understood from the mass service less than the said blind understood from touching parts of the elephant's body.

We are not about to defend the Christian sacraments here, and what is the use of defense and debate with people in whom the blindness of heart has been coupled with ill intentions, envy, pride and unfriendliness. They are like the Pharisees whom Christ refused to teach and to whom he refused to explain his sacraments because of the blindness of their hearts, their malice and their pride and whom He was content to scold with harsh words. Concerning the Pharisees, and those like them, Christ instructed his disciples: "Do not throw your gems before pigs so that they may not trample the gems with their feet and then turn on you and mangle you."

Were the three musketeers faithful Muslims with sincere intentions, we would remind them of the instruction of their prophet who said "do not argue with the followers of the book [Christians and Jews]." We would also remind them that the prophet instructed his people to respect the Christians "because they have priests and monks who do not act in arrogance," despite the ideological differences existing between Islam and Christianity. Many believe that what the Koran says about "the feast that God sent down from heaven to the apostles so that it may be a feast to their first and their last and a token from God" (surat al-ma'idah 111-114) is a frank reference to the holy communion which the Christians performed from the outset, of which the prophet was aware and which he did not ridicule, unlike the article's three musketeers who liken the faithful receiving their communion to "the primitives of Australia and Africa who eat the lion's heart to become lions." Had these three asked one of the participants in the mass about the meaning of his participation, about the motive of faith that stirs him and about the spiritual fruit that he reaps from the feast of love and peace, they could have possibly understood and they could have possibly remained silent, and their silence would have been wiser and more prudent.

We come now to the pope's visit to the United States which, it seems, is the crux of the article, and ask with astonishment: Why does this Iranian who is as "fanatic as teenagers" insist on finding in the pope's trip "the direct reply to the Iranian revolution" and on linking it with the trip of Peter the Pious who mobilized the west, or Europe, against the east 9 centuries ago?

In these words of the Iranian, there are two accusations: One ridiculous and the other serious.

The ridiculous aspect lies in imagining the pope being envious of the leadership of Khomeyni who, according to the Iranian, "projected Islam in all the international information media for 3 months...so that...the masses in the west have had Islam for breakfast and Islam for lunch." It sounds as if

the Iranian imagines that Pope John Paul II also has Khomeyni for lunch. Therefore, and as long as there is no reason for the media to go to the Vatican, as the Iranian claims, and considering that the Iranian revolution has brought the media to Khomeyni's mosque, "it was decided that the pope would go to the media and so he came to the United States!"

Is it true that the information media have no reason to go to the Vatican where there is a constant stream of visitors and pilgrims, of whom the pope receives tens of thousands every week, not to mention the big occasions when hundreds of thousands from all four corners of the world meet in his presence? Moreover, what is the pope's behavior or statements entitles the "teenage" Iranian to think that the pope is jealous and envious of Khomeyni and what hostile position has the pope taken against the Iranian revolution so that the Iranian may censure him? Isn't this ridiculous?

As for the serious aspect, it lies in the implicit instigation emanating from the comparison between the pope and Peter the Pious—a comparison portraying the pope touring and calling for a new crusade and urging "the Christian west to confront the Muslim east." (This is the title of the article and a letter can be understood from its title). It seems that the article's three musketeers are convinced of this. It pleases the Pakistani to see "this papal visit as the beginning of the religious movement." The Pakistani also considers the French army's move in Bokassa's empire the start of the return of the European colonialism and asserts that "there is an ever-growing conviction in the west of the need to use force against the third world." When analyzing "the proposal presented to President Carter to declare the OPEC a national enemy of the U.S. people," the Pakistani finds that though "theoretically sound" this proposal lacks two elements: The ideological cover which alone can stir the masses and the heroic leader prepared to perform this role. "This is why, the Pakistani says, the western media are trying to project the pope in the role of this leader!"

Thus, this wretched Muslim finds himself facing a ready crusade with all its elements complete and lives, after publishing the article, trembling in fear, with his hand on his heart and counting down the days while waiting for the ominous zero hour in which the Christian west will pounce on him under the pope's leadership!

Now, what do all these statements mean and why this insistence on distorting the image of the pope and on pinning these strange accusations on him when the entire world is pleased with his statements, stances and initiatives and when this world is praising this extraordinary religious personality who is prepared to perform a major role to serve the world's peace? TIME magazine has said about him what it has never said about anybody else, describing him as "the brilliant leader for whom the world thirsts and who is capable to stir people to realize accomplishments bigger than their thinking.... He is the man of all ages and all beliefs." Billy Graham,

the famous Protestant preacher, has described him as "the most highly respected religious leader in the world." Rosalyn Carter, the U.S. president's wife, welcomed him as an "example of the vision that unites mankind, the vision of our creator."

So why this rash attack on Christianity and on the head of the church of 700 million followers and the head of a state which continues to refuse until this moment to recognize the State of Israel and to submit to the "Judaization" of Jerusalem? In whose interest is all this and who benefits from this defamation campaign? Does AL-HAWADITH seek to create a new 13 April through this campaign? The magazine's editorial management has declared that "the discussion is open." So, does it expect this discussion to lead to a new sedition?

Else, what is it? What does AL-HAWADITH editorial management seek? Publication of the article was decided at an "editorial meeting," as the explanation published in edition No 1200 points out, despite all the pitfalls to which the editorial management refers in its explanation. The management coupled its explanation with a response to the article attributed to Dr George Farran. I do not know who Dr Farran is. It has been said that he is a mere name with which the editorial management signed this response which does not diverge in its contents from the views expressed in the explanation and there is absolutely no difference in form or style between the explanation and the response. AL-HAWADITH is skillfull in these methods and considers them a form of journalistic shrewdness, and they are, except in this case. In this case, they constitute nothing but an abortive trick and a shameful approach.

All these means with which the man in charge of AL-HAWADITH has tried to disavow and camouflage deceive nobody at all. The question we ask him remains: Who benefits from this article? Who benefits from slandering and defaming Catholicism, the head of its church and the head of the only state that has not recognized the State of Israel and the state whose head has not accepted the "Judaization of Jerusalem?" Logically, the only beneficiary is this state [the State of Israel]. Isn't it so?

Will Salim al-Lawzi accept that such questions be raised and such suspicions engulf him and his magazine?

8494
CSO: 4802

SOCIOLOGIST ANALYZES ISLAM'S CHALLENGE TO WEST

Paris LE MONDE in French 9 Dec 79 p 16

[Interview with Egyptian sociologist Anwar Abdel-Malek by Paul Balta:
"Islam's Challenge to the West"—date and place not given]

[Text] The disorders unfolding in the Arab-Moslem world betoken a clash of civilizations. The Egyptian sociologist Anwar Abdel-Malek analyzes this colossal challenge thrown to the West.

Egyptian sociologist, research fellow at the National Center for Scientific Research, Anwar Abdel-Malek also heads the "project on socio-cultural development alternatives in a changing world" of the United Nations University whose headquarters are in Tokyo. He has published two series of books in French, Arabic, and English. His works on the Arab world include "Egypt: A Military Society," "Contemporary Arabic Political Thought," "Ideology and National Rebirth," and "Modern Egypt."

The other series, dealing with a restructuring of political and social theory around the social dialectic, includes "Sociology of Imperialism," "The Army in the Nation," and "Specificity and Social Theory."

[Question] Periodically, since the end of World War II, convulsions have shaken the Arab and Islamic world, which extends from the Atlantic (Morocco, Mauritania) to the Pacific (Indonesia) and from the Mediterranean (Maghreb, Machrek) to the Gulf of Benin (Nigeria), and counts close to 1 billion people. How do you explain these phenomena, which surprise when they do not frighten the West?

[Answer] Let me respond with a question: How is it that the war in Indochina, the transformations in Cuba and Nicaragua, the crisis in southern Africa--not to mention the Sino-Japanese Treaty of August 1978, which lays the foundation for the third center of worldwide influence in the future--that all these events appear, if I may dare to say, less menacing than the revolutions and transformations in progress in the Islamic Afro-Asiatic area, whose geopolitical epicenter is Egypt. Yet the latter are part of the

totality of national liberation movements. But one must follow this further: as one senses in the West, this movement, which arises in a highly particular way in this area of civilization where more than eight hundred million people live with unique intensity, has its own tonality, its own specificity.

Up until the beginning of the 16th Century, the East--that is to say the sphere of Asiatic civilization around China and the sphere of Islamic Afro-Asiatic civilization around the Arab nation--was pre-eminent. Not only were Chinese science and technology superior to those of the West, but so were medicine, logic, mathematics, chemistry, geography, throughout the Islamic world, both Arab and Persian. The two areas were linked by the routes of the silk-traders...

Isolation

The great maritime discoveries of the 15th Century and the circumnavigation of the globe, the rise of the Portuguese middle classes and merchants in the great centers of Mediterranean Europe, resulted in the isolation of the Arabic epicenter, progressive concentration of the wealth, from the Crusades to the black slave trade and the despoiling of the Indians, then, subsequently, colonialism and imperialism in the southern, south-eastern, and later still the eastern part of the Asiatic continent: for five centuries, Europe's phenomenal expansion laid the foundations for a pre-eminence that remains to the present day.

The East remained quiescent during this swing of the pendulum. The East, it was said, was in decline. Let us see. Recent studies have shown that this was not really the case. The social and national continuity of political power and the power of cultural and spiritual ties of the great religions of the East, Islam and Buddhism, were not adequately taken into account. In fact, the East held out, albeit in second place. Then came the epoch of the great bourgeois, democratic, scientific, rationalistic revolutions in the Europe of the Enlightenment. Under the impact of the penetration of the great European empires, the East, which was sleeping, asked itself a double question: Why the decline? How to revive?

Resurgence

The resurgence of the East, courted since the second half of the 18th Century, principally in Egypt, then, half a century later, in China, India, and finally Japan, became divided into two camps: that of the westernized liberal modernists, and that of the fundamentalists--and reactionaries, as they are so often abusively called--who were searching in the return to the foundations of their national cultures, with their philosophic and religious components, for the keys to a rebuilding of the enfeebled body of the nation.

In these two areas of civilization, the specific feature was modulated in two different ways. It is sufficient to look at the map to see that it has

been the Arab-Islamic world which, since the First Crusade (Ninth Century) up to our own day, is in closest proximity to the penetration of the West; thus it is within the latter that tensions are most radical and profound. The tonality of the resurgence of the Islamic East appears the more harsh for its proximity to Europe and because two of the three oldest nations in the world, Egypt and Persia (the third being China) adopted Islam in the Seventh Century. This resurgence of Islamic tradition, accompanied by that of eastern Christianity, is manifesting itself in populist radicalism and cultural revival just at the moment when the West is assuming a very different character from that of the great revolutionary epoch. In effect, it split into two very different parts in 1917, its epicenter shifted from Europe to the United States, and it is undergoing a crisis which is less that of petroleum or markets than a crisis of its whole Promethean scheme of civilization.

The extreme limit

The West seems to have reached the extreme limit of this scheme, in which man, master and conqueror of nature, proposed unlimited production oriented toward exponentially increasing consumption aiming at enjoyment and pleasure. At the very time when one sees an immense quest for values and ideals, the Western sky seems singularly bare; from which springs the explosive, astonishing, unacceptable aspect of the resurgence of the East. It is there, I think, that one must search for the source of the shock, the undercurrent of anger, the anxiety which you mention, because the East, in quest of spirituality, renaissance, and not only independence, seems to show the West glimpses of its own emptiness. Now you see the submerged part of the iceberg, which goes well beyond the oil and financial crises.

[Question] Doubtless, but today Mossadegh, Nasser, and Boumedienne cut a rational and moderate figure by comparison with the Imam Khomeyni. One has the feeling that, along with the will to independence, we are seeing a return to the Middle Ages, with obscurantist overtones, to the point that one must ask whether it is Mossadegh or Khomeini who incarnates Islamic politics, of which you are a theoretician.

[Answer] The Iranian revolution was preceded, a quarter of a century ago, by the Nasserian revolution (1952-1970) which was--with the Chinese revolution--the most important political event of the second half of the 20th Century. It was accompanied by Mossadegh's action (1951-1953), which roused the excitement of the masses and provoked against him one of the bloodiest coups d'etat of our era (some 10,000 deaths), not forgetting the Algerian war (1954-1962), happily overtaken by the realism and wisdom of the adversaries of the past.

Shi'ites and Sunnites

It is nevertheless true that there still exists a split which comes to us from history. In effect, after the first four caliphs, successors of the

Prophet Mohammad, the power of Islam was attached, between the ninth and fourteenth centuries, to the Omayyad dynasty in Syria and the Abbasid in Baghdad, then to the national dynasties of Egypt and to the prestigious martial dynasties of Morocco. From a sociological point of view, this signifies that it was the sedentary populations of the old water-oriented societies, near the ports and great crossroads of international commerce, that institutionalized political and spiritual power: Sunnite Islam.

In return, the Shi'ite irredentists, pushed back into the hinterlands of east and central Asia, continued their ardent quest for historical legitimacy and for national, stabilized state power. In the Sunnite zone, a symbiosis was achieved between spiritual and temporal power, the latter having since long ago, in ancient states like Egypt, pre-eminence over the former. The spiritual came to legitimize and reinforce in some ways the authority of the state, which profited from the antiquity and depth of the field of history. This explains how, for example, the revolution of Nasir, heir to this history, could have been a national revolution which aimed at the restructuring, then the strategic development, of the economy, the society, and the culture toward socialism, within the context of an Arabic, African, Islamic, eastern culture.

It is here that one can see the difference from Islamic politics in the Shi'ite vein of Ayatollah Khomeyni, in the way in which the Iranian people, for the first time in two centuries, endow themselves with a national, independent state. Today, this state is in the hands of the popular masses, difficult, it is true, to control at this stage. But let us recall the stirrings and violent shifts which were produced, in a nation as highly structured as France, during its revolution. A great number of years was necessary to bring France from 1789 to the Empire, the Napoleonic Code, the Ecole Polytechnique...

It is also necessary to compare the contributions of Mohamed Ali with Tah-tawi and the Saint-Simonians in Egypt, to those of the Pahlavi and SAVAK in Iran, the absence of national autonomy and the penetration of state institutions by Zionist services. The Iranian revolution wanted to put an end to these discrepancies and recover the state for Iran. For the moment, religion has replaced the traditional type of state, but one can speculate that rationality will return and the state will be endowed with its proper institutions.

The October War

[Question] How do you explain the expansion of Islam in Africa and the reverberations of the Iranian revolution that one finds throughout most of the Arab countries, while the leaders of these states seem to fear the effects of its contagion, as was recently noted at the Tunis summit?

[Answer] The expansion of Islam as a model for civilization is felt even more strongly in Asia than in Africa. The turning point was the October War

of 1973, which indirectly unleashed the oil crisis, suddenly revealing the extreme fragility of the Promethean model of civilization of the Western bourgeois societies. It was only natural that vast sectors of the Moslem Afro-Asiatic countries--and as much in the ranks of the common people as in those of the middle classes and the intelligentsia, upon thus seeing the credibility of this Western modernization crumble, should have wished to return to the foundations of their national cultures, of which the most basic is Islam and its heritage. Since that time, the Iranian revolution has multiplied the effects of the October War.

From that time on, the question was posed: Why not, after all, follow our own path? Why not try to achieve a critical modernity rather than an imitative modernism, as the Moroccan leader and thinker Allal El Fassi said in the 1940's? On this point, it is fitting to note the communal character of sedentary, Afro-Asiatic rural societies, which endorse the notions of fatherland, social and family solidarity, a community of believers, consensus, national unity rather than the values of individualism, that ghetto of egoism bound up in the race for profit and pleasures. Briefly, from 1973 to 1979 the Afro-Asiatic world--not only the Islamic--made a powerful return to the profoundly vital legacy of its own uniqueness. It is here that the reverberation of the Iranian revolution in the Arab world finds its explanation: it is, at the same time, an objective extension and a deepening of the line of march of Nasirism and the great Arab national revolutions, notably in Algeria. This reverberation, combining the "oumma" (community of the faithful) with the political primacy of national rebirth, reaches not only the popular masses and the national bourgeoisies, but also the intellectuals and the previously mute armed forces.

Counterblow?

[Question] Are we heading inevitably toward a violent confrontation between the East and the West?

[Answer] In times of crisis, our common duty is to keep our heads, to maintain our moral and intellectual responsibility. Among the causes of the current unrest, there is to begin with an economic-strategic factor: the restructuring of international relations which is called the new international economic order, which--although it is not an economic war--has brought to the fore in an extremely disturbing way since 1973 in the Arab-Islamic region--the oil crisis. All the world feels thus involved on a daily basis with the events which transpire there. Beyond that, as we have already seen, the confusion which has been produced in this region is accompanied by a quest that is spiritual, religious, philosophical, and moral, at the very same time as the consumer ethic, the pleasure ethic, and the ethic of individualism are caught in dilemmas which can only deepen. It is this which, to my mind, lies at the basis of the unrest.

It is possible to conceive that in certain conditions the only solution would be to put an end to it, by the violent suppression of this challenge,

which appears as a negation of the West. For my part, I would envision prospects which are more complex, but also more humane, more constructive, and more realistic. The annihilation of Islamic politics seems, after all, a difficult job on the operational level, and considering the concentrations of populations and the economic, political, and human potential within this immense arc. It would be a case, at best, of a counterblow which would not resolve the crisis of the Western consumer societies any more than it would miraculously make oil more abundant.

[Question] Isn't the world geo-political balance also a factor that should be taken into account?

[Answer] Exactly. The Islamic Afro-Asiatic region borders the Soviet Union, China, and India, and it is Moslem populations that live at the junction of the two great socialist powers. One can thus foresee that a prolonged operation in this region would arouse anxiety, and perhaps a counterreaction, on the part of the Soviet Union, which is directly concerned with the security of its borders, and with its present and future supplies of gas and oil. All these reasons lead me to believe that the most extreme scenarios merely play on the sensitivity of public opinion, stirred up by the predominantly metropolitan mass media, rather than proceeding from intelligent thought.

Another voice

Certainly, the current period of tension will continue for a generation--and transform the world. Conflicts, contradictions, regional confrontations, periodic crises will be our daily bread, in the meantime. But the overall balance of power will forbid crossing the threshold of maximum tolerance and continuing on toward a world war. This intense dialectical process will lead to a non-synchronous restructuring of certain factors (energy, food, control of space and the oceans), as it will lead to a worldwide movement of critical and comparative reflection; the "other," the "others," will no longer be the "barbarians," of reductionist clichés. Questions will be posed such as: "How can one be a Persian, French, American, Ethiopian, Egyptian, or Mexican, in the contemporary world?"; or again, "How to combine authenticity and modernity, specificity and contemporaneity, the past and the future, without losing oneself?"

This great questioning of the philosophy of history and the sociology of civilizations is becoming today the focal point of the intellectual quest, in a time of growing risks. There is no royal road. But it is important to note that while from the West there once arose the voice of Charles de Gaulle, today from the West comes the voice of John Paul II, who explicitly wants to base the continuance of the West on a return to the sources of its Christian authenticity and on a dialog with the non-Western worlds of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, as well as with the socialist societies.

Is this not in fact a line of action parallel to that of Islamic politics? To that of the great Maoist synthesis between Chinese philosophy and the socialist revolution? Why refuse to see these bridges--these possibilities of a non-conflictive dialog of civilizations--which could lead toward complementarity, mutual enrichment, greater security for all, a less inhumane life, and a world in which spirituality and the satisfaction of needs would not be mutually exclusive? A world in which men would agree at last to work out a new model for civilization--a model allowing for multiple paths, excluding Prometheanism and Manicheism, accepting at the same time brotherhood and the urgency of the dangers threatening the globe, chiefly the self-destructive dimension of nuclear arms.

9516

CS0: 4800

AYATOLLAH MONTAZERI EXPLAINS STANCE VERSUS UNITED STATES, NEIGHBORING STATES

Beirut AL-SAFIR in Arabic 19 Nov 79 p 12

[Interview with Ayatollah Montazeri by Basim al-Sab': "We Are in Position of Attack Against United States; Saddam's Criticism Inspired by Others"]

[Text] Tehran--Ayatollah Montazeri, the chairman of the Council of Experts [majlis al-khubara'] and the Imam of Tehran, has asserted that the Iranian revolution is not in the position of reaction or defense and that it is still in the position of attack against the U.S. stance.

Montazeri has denied that the embassy operation has taken place as a screen for dismissal of the former government or for passing the constitution.

He criticized the Iraqi position and President Saddam Husayn's position in particular and has described Husayn's statements on Iran as "statements inspired by others."

Montazeri's statements were made during an interview which AL-SAFIR conducted with him at his headquarters in the Council of Experts and in the office which was used by the former shah and has now turned into the private office of the Imam of Tehran.

During the interview, Montazeri sat on the floor covered with a thick moquette in the big salon with its conference table which the shah used for his meetings with his visitors at the parliament.

Following is the text of the questions and the answers:

[Question] The revolution is currently facing the dilemma of the challenge against the United States. How will the revolution, which is young in its capabilities and experience, be able to confront this challenge and what are the forms that this confrontation will assume?

[Answer] Iran's revolution is, as you have said, young but the Iranian people have been able, with their sacrifices, to take their first steps. The more martyrs this revolution offers and the more the people lose in terms of their money and resources the more steadfast they will become.

The internal enemy, who happened to be the shah, exerted strong pressure on the people and that pressure only made the people stand fast more resolutely and cling to their rights more firmly. To destroy the shah, the people offered many sacrifices and martyrs. If the external enemy wants to attack us now, it is a foregone conclusion that the Iranian people will sacrifice and will fight more firmly in the future.

The world today is not as it used to be in the past when the U.S. imperialism could occupy a country easily if it wished to do so. They have tried this in Vietnam and other places and they have found that exerting pressure on peoples, killing and falsification can only cause them harm. Even the American people themselves opposed their administration, saying that it squandered their resources and killed their troops. This is why the U.S. administration whose actions are opposed by its people cannot exert pressure on us today. If it intends to attack Iran, then the Iranian people who offered thousands of martyrs in the face of their internal enemy will stand fast more resolutely in the face of their external enemy. We consider martyrdom through Islam and for God as perfection and we ask for martyrdom for the sake of God.

Another Vietnam

[Question] Do you think that [do you believe in] psychological mobilization to confront a major power such as the United States?

[Answer] I have said that the United States, even if it is a super power, cannot attack us unless it has lost its mind and unless it wants to create another Vietnam. I believe that the pressure by the U.S. people, like the pressure exerted in the case of Vietnam, will prevent it from committing such an act. We want the U.S. people to oppose their administration because, in addition to squandering the people's resources, this administration has destroyed the prestige of the U.S. people, especially in the third world, Palestine and Lebanon. Does the aid that the United States advance to Israel, when Israel is killing the Palestinian and Lebanese brothers daily, serve the interest of the U.S. people? Does this mean anything other than squandering the people's money, levying taxes on them and oppressing them with heavy social burdens? We want the American people to oppose these actions. We want them to especially oppose the delivery of their monies to the tyrannical Israel to strike our brothers in southern Lebanon and the harboring of the traitor shah and the other criminals of the world. We believe that as there are oppressed in the third world, the majority of the Americans are also oppressed and their rights usurped, especially the U.S. blacks. The U.S. people believe in Christ and Christ fought tyranny, dictatorship and crimes. Isn't it the duty of these Christians in the United States to oppose their administration for harboring the criminal shah? Does Christ condone this and was this his will?

Rather, It Is Attack

[Question] In the first days of the U.S. embassy operation, you were in the position of [initiating the] action. Now that 15 days have passed since the

operation took place, it seems that the picture is changing. You are in the position of reaction and the United States is in the opposite position. The United States puts a stop to the importation of oil and you then stop pumping [production]. The United States declares the freezing of assets and you then declare their withdrawal. Don't you think that the Iranian position is shaky at present?

[Answer] There are no Iranian reactions. We are proceeding on our path and we are not in the position of reaction and defense. We are carrying out our work without fear of the United States. Our position was offensive originally and it is still so. As for the issue of the oil embargo, all the oil areas of Iran asked us to put an embargo on oil to the United States and the Revolution Council was thinking of this issue. We had adopted a position in this regard before the U.S. administration adopted its position to stop the importation of oil but the United States declared its position before we did. The word reaction may have been used in the papers but we are still in the position of attack.

We Don't Antagonize Any People

[Question] It is reiterated that the embassy operation was carried out to provide a screen for local conditions, including the government's inability to solve some problems, such as unemployment and inflation, and to stress the need for approving the constitution which has been under discussion for a long time. What is your opinion?

[Answer] Unemployment, inflation and numerous other problems are inherited from the defunct regime. But now that the United States has adopted the deposed shah and has agreed to give him asylum, Muslim students have occupied the embassy. This step is not meant to cover the problems. The actions carried out by imperialism are meant to distort the facts. We know that the United States is trying to distort our reputation in the western society. We harbor no hostility to any state or any people and we want our relations to be relations of friendship with all and to be established on reciprocal treatment, provided that no state interfere in determining our future or plundering our resources, be such a state western or eastern.

[Question] Assuming that the shah's issue was not present or that he has died, what would your position vis-a-vis the U.S. policy be?

[Answer] In case the shah dies and the United States stops plotting against us and seeks to establish serious relations with us, then we are not the enemies of anybody. Our revolution is an Islamic revolution and our goal is an Islamic goal. We do not want to humiliate anybody and we don't want money from anybody. But if the United States wants to resume its previous attitude and if it doesn't stop its plots, then we will stand against it. The evidence of its plots in Kurdistan, Khuzestan and other provinces is ample.

[Question] It seems that the U.S. economic blockade against Iran is not the only one aimed at you. You are surrounded by neighbors, including Afghanistan, Saudi Arabia, Qatar and Bahrain (and Iraq, adds Montazeri), against whom you have launched a violent attack recently. How will you deal with this issue and what is the nature of the relations with these countries?

[Answer] We have felt recently that some neighboring countries have moved against us. Foremost is Iraq which is working against Iran to the degree that Saddam Husayn has said in a press interview that Iraq is not in confrontation with Israel but in confrontation with an "Iranian colonization." We know that Saddam Husayn does not have the capability to make such statements and that these statements are inspired by others. Until sometime ago, the shah performed the role of the area's policeman and perhaps Saddam Husayn himself want to perform this role to a certain extent. They want to distort the Iranian revolution and they say that we want to intervene in other areas, such as Bahrain, Kuwait and Iraq. All this is false and a twisting of the facts.

As I have already said in a Friday sermon, we do not covet a single inch of the territories of our neighbors, not in Bahrain, not in Iraq and not in Kuwait. They must believe that the path we are following is the path of defending Islam and that we do not want to attack any state. But our task requires us to protect the oppressed. When our Palestinian brothers and our brothers in southern Lebanon and Afghanistan are attacked, defending them becomes a humanitarian duty dictated by the conscience and by religion--"and be enemies of the tyrant and supporters of the oppressed." But we have no intention to attack any neighboring country. We are marching forth on our path, regardless of whether the United States approves or not and regardless of whether the neighboring countries approve or not.

Naturally, I don't mean by my words all the Arab countries but only some of them. All the words I have addressed to the Arab heads of state have been intended for advice solely because the Muslim is the brother of the Muslim and the duty of every Muslim requires him to order good deeds and to proscribe abominable deeds. These words that I am addressing to the Arab heads of state are meant for advice and not for a threat. Let them learn a lesson from the shah's fate because my heart burns for them. I am only advising them. Peoples have become enlightened and aware of their responsibilities. Any people suffering under oppression will move and will not remain silent, as they used to do in the past. The world is now closely interconnected. There is radio, television and telephone and peoples learn from each other and see that the oppressed have triumphed against the oppressors. This gives peoples the sense of the responsibility to confront tyranny.

What is right must be said. One of our problems is that we did not dispatch after the revolution delegations to explain our good intentions to the neighboring and to the European countries and to demonstrate to them sincerely the truth of this Islamic revolution. Perhaps this is the reason why our revolution is misunderstood abroad.

The pen was, unfortunately, in the hand of the enemy who started to write and say that fascism has come to Iran and who started to talk about the executions, the killings and other things. But we will, God willing, send delegations very shortly to explain the goals of our revolution to the western and neighboring countries.

Left, Right and South

[Question] What is your evaluation of the nature of the relations with the leftist and rightist political forces existing in Iran?

[Answer] Our revolution is an Islamic revolution that has no connection with the left or the right. Our Islam is a straight Islam. The tree of Islam is straight and is neither eastern nor western. We have not changed our position at all. We accept whatever is Islamic and we have no intention to commit aggression against anybody. We refuse that anybody, be he eastern or western, interfere in our affairs. Our government will be an Islamic government.

We are enemies to nobody. It has been proven so far to everybody that freedom is present in Iran. But some people are trying to hatch plots and conspiracies against us, as has happened in Kurdistan and Khuzestan.

[Question] The Iranian revolution has sent more than one envoy to get acquainted with the situation in southern Lebanon. Have any specific measures been taken in this regard?

[Answer] So far, I am not aware of the measures taken in regard to southern Lebanon. But I support the delivery of aid to the south. This is the duty of every Muslim. I hope that in the future we will devote greater attention to foreign affairs than we are devoting now. This is presently the case because imperialism does not give us a chance to even scratch our head.

Upon completing the question to this answer, Montazeri asked that the interview be ended because it was time for prayer and even past the time of prayer and of fast breaking--the ayatollah was one of thousands who declared a political fast.

Notice: The questions were addressed in Arabic and Imam Montazeri answered them in Farsi.

8494

CSO: 4802

OPPOSITION PARTIES' DESTRUCTIVE METHODS HARM NATION

Tel Aviv HAZOFEH in Hebrew 9 Nov 79 p 3

[Article: "Opposition Party Ought To Fight Fairly"]

[Text] The campaign of opposition at any price is carried on by the alinement. It makes one wonder about its ability to lead a stable and constitutional government. In a democratic country worthy of its name there is room for parties in power and parties in the opposition. All movements have a constructive role in democratic life and all contribute to the country and its citizens. Any opposing party, naturally, hopes to be in power ultimately. But it ought to remember that when the time comes when it is in power, the current ruling party will be the opposition. Therefore, it ought to select a political weapon which does not backfire.

It is important to choose a weapon that will be efficient but not cruel. The opposition is entitled to use its weapon against the government, but not against the form of government and certainly not against the country.

The Histadrut as a Political Weapon

It is not this way in Israel. We can see that the alinement fights the government too strenuously and often does not play by the rules of constitutional states. The Histadrut, which is utilized unfairly, does not "belong" only to the Labor Party of the alinement, but to all workers in Israel. There is constant incitement of worker committees--especially in government offices and government owned plants, as well as in highly sensitive places--to call strikes and confrontations, all of which cause discomfort and difficulties for our people. All this is done in order to create political unrest, hundreds of thousands of workdays are lost to the economy and losses of billions of pounds are incurred, which further shakes the economy.

This is how hidden unemployment of thousands, maybe even hundreds of thousands, is created. All this is done under the claim of supposedly protecting the rights of the workers, or lessening their burden or efforts, by increasing their numbers above and beyond what is necessary for the economy or to raise productivity.

It is no secret that productivity in Israel is one of the lowest in the world--in spite of an investment of billions in mechanization and modernization.

The percentage of service workers is far higher than that in other industrialized countries, whereas the quality of services is very poor.

Ridiculous Norms

Norms that are set are ridiculous. There are places where a worker can produce seven "norms" a day. The average standard of living in Israel is much higher than the GNP, and as a result Israel's national debt has been increasing drastically to the point that it endangers our national existence. All this is done by the opposition in the hope of toppling the government at any price, as if to say: "Let us die with you."

In regard to political weapons, the situation is very bad, too. Mr Bar-Lev, general secretary of the Labor Party, supports the PLO's legal arguments on the evacuation of Elon-Moreh. The younger generation in the Labor Party also overtly supports an independent Palestinian state. Peres has hinted to the American administration that he would be "reasonable" in negotiations on the future of the West Bank and, therefore, it would be just as well if the American administration makes it difficult for Israel and "helps" its government to fall. There are unrestrained attacks on the IDF by personal attacks against the chief of staff, Lt Gen Refa'el Eytan. It is difficult to tolerate the personal injustice done to Eytan, who is known by all his acquaintances as the epitome of honesty, morality and fairness. But, as was mentioned, the alignment is not choosy about its means. Everything is permitted.

The other small opposition parties, such as Sheli, the Communists and others, do not even resort to a "fig leaf" approach and talk with venomous hatred about everything.

The media, regrettably, looks for sensations and does its best to expose every defect in vivid color, completely out of proportion. On the other hand they ignore, or cover up, anything positive that is accomplished. Thus, they create a distorted image about what is happening here. Obviously, it is common for our media to be quoted by our enemies throughout the world.

Self-Destruction

This atmosphere of "Let's attack them" even influences the ministers. Quite often one gets the feeling that they are fighting each other. All ministers are for cutbacks of billions, on one condition--that it does not affect their ministry. It is no secret that the present number of government and local employees could serve a country of 10 million, instead of 3.5 million, and even then it could be reduced.

No wonder morale is low and incentive is at a low ebb. There are no restraints. The administration is weak and this can be seen by the Arab communities. They see and feel quite well what is going on, and why shouldn't they exploit the situation for their own benefit? The commander of the military police has published some shocking facts. Thousands of soldiers are deserters. There are numerous cases in which soldiers sold weapons to Arabs. Drugs are being used by some serving on our security forces. The list goes on.

The sense of self-destruction keeps working and attacks everything.

There is no doubt that, in spite of it all, there are creative powers in this nation and a lot of light is shining from many directions. We have wonderful youth with a sense of self-sacrifice and honor of God. Many institutions and plants function impeccably. But the question still is, can this state afford--considering its economic, military and political situation--to continue to allow this deterioration on these most sensitive and vital issues, thus endangering our very existence? Israeli parties ought to adopt new standards of behavior and new norms of struggle. They ought to behave as the most orderly nations do.

Even countries that are at war do not utilize all destructive weapons at their disposal. There are rules of war which protect the warring countries, victorious and defeated alike, from total destruction. Why, then, can't parties within our country spare this enormous achievement which they themselves have helped to create? Why are they willing to destroy it and all its people? It is entirely possible that we may have to stem not only economic inflation but also the inflation in democratic rights, since they are so exploited.

We have become a joke among all our friends. No wonder our enemies think we are doing their work.

A party in opposition should fulfill its obligations faithfully. It should expose and protest weaknesses and fight negative phenomena. It should explain its different political way, which may be better and more just, but it cannot utilize destructive weapons or unacceptable means which threaten our very existence.

8646

CSO: 4805

CLOSURE OF 'HAZOFEH' LIKENED TO PARTY SUICIDE

Tel Aviv HAZOFEH in Hebrew 9 Nov 79 p 2

[Editorial: "Urgent Call on NRP To Rescind Its Decision To Close Down HAZOFEH"]

[Text] The NRP's central committee's decision a year ago to stop the publication of HAZOFEH was received uncomfortably by members and friends of the party. The veteran daily, established 43 years ago by the great late Rabbi Me'ir Bar-Ilan, is a public, political, cultural and literary treasure of the first degree for the national religious community. It is the only publication of the Mizrakhi movement, both in Israel and in the diaspora, which publishes news and commentary and guards Jewish values and issues. It is a source of Zionist religious thinking and a forum for evaluating Jewish literature and authors.

Like any other daily which reflects current events, their repercussions and assesses them, it needs to be constantly developed in regard to information and editorials, as well as format and scope. For many years it was on the rise. The central committee's shocking decision to silence the religious community damaged the paper extensively, although it continues to be published. The paper's thousands of readers are very critical of those who decided to close the paper down, thereby damaging it. They consider the decision stupid, shortsighted and rigid.

A party daily is always in the red. This is true of every such paper in the country. But it has no equal as the daily voice of the party and the movement. The list of public campaigns that the paper initiated, faithfully pursued and saw to victory is long. The paper is open minded and removed from party pettiness.

In many respects the daily paper is worth more than a representation in the Knesset or local governments. It serves as a bridge between the party and its members and nurtures their ideological, political and cultural companionship. The paper is not only a mouthpiece for the party, but its continued publication is its very spirit.

Closing down the HAZOFEH will be a heavy blow to the prestige of the NRP and the religious Zionist movement. Blows lead to other blows. A mute party, whose mouthpiece has been silenced while other, smaller parties, have daily papers, loses its credibility. In times of public campaigns, this party has to turn to hired writers.

The NRP is a central partner of the coalition. HAZOFEH, to a large extent, is the only publication which explains the government's policy in a balanced, factual manner, without avoiding self-criticism. The NRP's voice, balanced and true to principles, is heard daily via the media and reaches thousands of readers and listeners. The NRP can point to the fact that it alone, among the coalition parties, has a daily paper which explains both its position and that of the entire coalition.

Whether the government ends its term or conditions are such that early elections are called, we are approaching a climate of elections in Israel. The NRP will have to struggle to maintain its position as a central party with the ability to sway votes, as well as to try to improve its position on the political map. Its opponents are secular parties which conspire to neutralize the NRP with coalition combinations. The NRP will also confront religious parties, such as Hat'khiya and so forth, which will try to nibble at its electoral power. The daily newspaper is as necessary as air is for breathing. In the future, as in the distant and recent past, and in the present, too, it must be at the front. There is no substitute.

A large and complex party, such as the NRP, which is the uppermost party for organized religious Judaism, can withstand the financial burden of a daily paper. A true reorganization of management and editorial staff is needed. The best people should be channeled to these positions. If this is done, there is a good chance for increased circulation so that the resulting income could be counted in the total balance.

Before it is too late, activists of the NRP are implored upon to not close the paper; to close it would be tantamount to suicide. The first thing that has to be done is to convene the central committee of the party and the Po'el-Hamizrakhi. This meeting ought to be given the authority of a convention so it could decide on the future of the daily paper which for years has contributed to the rise of the party, to the development of its projects and to its numerous campaigns.

This convention would be most constructive not only if it decides to maintain the paper but also to strengthen it and broaden its scope, if it mandates thousands of members to subscribe to it and the institutions of the party to support it financially.

The sinful thought of silencing the mouthpiece of the national religious movement has to be dropped. Moreover, as a movement which wants to enhance its position and spread its values, the NRP is mandated to help HAZOFEH out of its financial straits and turn it into a viable organ for Judaism and its values and ways.

If, God forbid, the paper is closed down, there will not be a vacuum. Instead of a daily paper for the whole party, a paper which supports and unites what is common to all, there will be a lot of loud publications each promoting its own "stars" while maligning everyone else. There are already some signs of such divisive splinter papers.

The readers of HAZOFEH, loyalists of the united movement, warn that closing the paper would be like suicide by the party. This is a warning intended to prevent any further deterioration.

8646

CSO: 4805

AGUDAT ISRAEL STAND ON ABORTION LAUDED

Tel Aviv HAZOFEH in Hebrew 6 Nov 79 p 2

[Editorial: "Agudat Israel Is Praised for the Strong Stand It Took Against Abortion"]

[Text] It is very rare that Agudat Israel captures the headlines and is heard widely in the international arena. It is rare that the party is mentioned favorably. It has a lot of adversaries who are waiting for it to make a mistake, and they can be found on either side of the fence. Invariably, when it does make the headlines, as it did on 5 November, it is not for an insignificant reason but involves matters of theology. The editors, therefore, congratulate Agudat Israel for being "caught" for important things, whereas others are "caught" for trivial reasons. This is the only difference between Agudat Israel and other parties.

Agudat Israel has opinions and positions on every political, economic and social subject. Its representatives in the Knesset committees represent the party respectably. But it never uses its parliamentary power to its fullest extent, and it does have some clout on any other issue. Its representatives in the Knesset fight for their opinions and are among those who are heard quite often, if only because their opinions are original and based on ancient Jewish tradition. Its representatives in other national institutions fulfill their mission consistently and in a manner that evokes respect for them and their party.

But it has never thrown its full weight on any economic, political or social issues. Not because these subjects do not concern it, but because it always looks for a compromise. Its moderation tends to influence matters. Only when it comes to the basic issue, to the one issue about which the party really cares, has it ever done anything worth mentioning.

Agudat Israel was out of the coalition for many years. It was often referred to respectfully. Often, it could have had the decisive vote. But it preferred to forego the advantage of being in the coalition--and there is no need to explain what that buys--as long as its basic demands were not met. Those demands were always set by the learned men on its council,

which is Agudat Israel's highest authority. Its representatives always consider themselves as the spokesmen of the council. There was no other reward, financial or prestige, that could sway the party. It was never in the opposition for the sake of opposing. Exclusion from the coalition was never a burden, and it certainly did not bother its conscience.

Following the political "revolution" of the elections to the ninth Knesset, a new atmosphere was created, in which the basic demands of Agudat Israel were accepted. This time the party revealed a position unheard of in Israeli politics. It voluntarily gave up any position in the coalition, in a ministry, or in the executive branch. All its demands were restricted to theological matters. Even when it demanded that a discrimination be corrected it was a matter of theology, for the sake of strengthening religious education in all its aspects.

It would be more than audacious to accuse Agudat Israel of "blackmail" as the chairman of the Likud delegation to the Knesset has just done. For Agudat Israel this is strictly a matter of conscience, and nothing else. This is a question pertaining to the future of the Jewish people. There is no selfishness here. On the contrary, those who fight the revocation of the social subsection of the abortion law are shockingly selfish themselves, and can only be accused of pursuing convenience. They would like a state of lawlessness. Agudat Israel has a matter of theology at hand. Even the mere fact that the subject has been put in the headlines is valuable, even as a protest against a conspiracy to hurt thousands of innocent souls and if only to bring the matter to the attention of thousands, many of whom are so misled that they do not realize the seriousness of the sin. Thus, Agudat Israel has shown again that it has not regressed in any way from the line it has drawn, and that to date it has been perfectly obedient to its learned council and follows the commands it gives. Lucky are those who are partners in this respect for the Torah.

8646

CSO: 4805

SETTLERS MUST COOPERATE WITH GOVERNMENT POLICY

Tel Aviv HAZOFEH in Hebrew 9 Nov 79 p 2

[Editorial: "Call To Evacuate Elon-Moreh With No Further Delays"]

[Text] The ministerial committee for defense matters has empowered the defense minister to discuss with the settlers of Elon-Moreh the issues of their temporary and permanent resettlement after they evacuate the present site in accordance with the ruling of the Supreme Court. As reported, the settlers refused to meet with the defense minister. They explained this decision in a letter to the prime minister, saying that the minister's position is well known and that there is no possibility that they can reach an agreement with him. They would like to negotiate with the prime minister himself.

Their refusal is unacceptable. Settlement is dependent on government funds and government security forces, and it is inconceivable that the settlers can decide whom they will and will not talk to. It was reported later that Gush Emunim would decide on 9 November about meeting with the defense minister. The resolution of the ministerial committee should prevail.

The court's deadline is set for 22 November. It is hoped that the evacuation can be accomplished without any confrontation and that resettlement can be done at another location in the region. It is inconceivable that the settlers will insist on remaining on the site so that force will have to be used. Such a miserable scene ought to be avoided. A spectacular evacuation would hurt the settlers themselves. The threats to enlist supporters from throughout the country to help in the confrontation with the IDF are empty threats. Most of the public would denounce a superfluous and harmful confrontation between the settlers and the government, the IDF and the rest of the population. Law and order apply to all without exception.

The proposed sites for temporary and permanent resettlements ought to be examined factually, and the final decision should be up to the government. Ultimatums should not be issued. With all due respect to the pioneering

spirit, the national religious camp, from which most of the settlers come, is encouraged by this spirit which leads to settlements in all parts of the Land of Israel. But a limit has to be recognized. It is also better to talk with understanding to a government for whom the concept of a whole Israel and the idea of settlement are a matter of policy.

It is very desirable to hasten the settlers' evacuation and temporary re-settlement. The more the settlers prefer to make threats, the more they will harm themselves and all of us. The settlers are bound by the government's resolutions.

The approach of the NRP ministers is reasonable. It calls for a broad settlement plan in the region which is well financed and secure against legal challenges. The settlers want progress toward their goals, which ought to be the concern of the settlement policy. The details of the plan are controversial. All of its aspects should be considered, and the majority view ought to prevail. Friends and supporters of the settlement idea, those who have considerable strength in the government, want the settlers to enable them to formulate a practical plan.

In the negotiations between the settlers and the government the whole question of settlement is at stake and not just that of Elon-Moreh. Therefore, it is most desirable that political goals be checked, for stubbornness can topple the government. This is what the extreme organization, which came out of an extreme ideological group, wants. The more this trend is held in check within Gush Enumin, the more chance there is for an agreement.

Those who seek a confrontation, as their cliches demand, will not topple the government, but they could disrupt settlement. Political interests could raise a lot of dust but hurt the very cause of establishing Jewish settlements in Judea and Samaria. This is not true of the pioneering, who are absorbed with the goal of diligently enlarging Jewish settlement with a sense of devotion and great responsibility. This contributed to the larger settlement projects in the country.

The national religious community, which looks upon all settlement in Judea and Samaria with favor, has a vested interest in the settlements proceeding in an orderly and respectable manner.

8646
CSJ: 4805

AUTHORITY OF PUBLIC RELATIONS MINISTRY MUST BE SET DOWN

Tel Aviv HAZOFEH in Hebrew 5 Nov 79 p 2

[Editorial: "The Reinstated Public Relations Ministry Should Have the Authority That Its Predecessor Lacked"]

[Text] The government's resolution to establish a public relations ministry has both good and bad aspects. When the Likud government was formed, the prime minister said that there is no need in a democratic society for a police or internal public relations ministry. The government has followed this principle. It abolished the separate police ministry and made it part of the Interior Ministry. Likewise, it did not reinstate the public relations ministry which had been abolished by the previous administration following the resignation of Public Relations Minister Aharon Yariv, who claimed there was no need for this ministry.

The idea of reinstating a public relations ministry grew out of coalitionary needs. But the Israeli public relations problem has always been on the agenda. The feeling is that our overseas public relations work is ineffective. Former foreign ministers adamantly refused to have public relations roles taken away from them. The public relations ministries that were established handled only internal public relations, whereas public relations for the outside world remained within the jurisdiction of the Foreign Ministry. This is why Aharon Yariv resigned. He felt he lacked the tools and authority to conduct a public relations job.

The scenario may repeat itself this time, too. The Foreign Ministry will object to having any overseas public relations issues taken away from it and, as the prime minister says, in a democratic country there is no need for internal public relations since democratic governments do not reeducate citizens with governmental decrees, but, rather, they let them think for themselves and make their decisions on election day.

Against this background it will probably be very difficult to reinstate the public relations ministry, with its mechanism dissected and its minister lacking any real authority to act. The broadcasting authority is an institution in itself, independent of the government. There are some who

think it is totally independent on all fronts. We have seen this recently when for 2 days the national broadcasting system headlined the story of the officer involved in the Litani operation who was sentenced for killing a terrorist but his sentence was reduced by the chief of staff. It cannot be assumed that the new public relations minister will achieve what his predecessors could not, namely, the direction and balancing of our media. Public relations work overseas is in the hands of the Foreign Ministry representatives and, although they have not accomplished much, it will be difficult to remove them from their traditional jurisdiction and transfer them to a new public relations ministry. Therefore, the reinstatement of a public relations ministry should be followed very carefully so as to not turn it into an empty ministry lacking authority.

8646

CSO: 4805

NEW POLICE SUPERINTENDENT FACES MANY CHALLENGES

Tel Aviv HAZOFEH in Hebrew 6 Nov 79 p 2

[Editorial: "Thoughts on the Police on the Occasion of the Appointment of a New Superintendent"]

[Text] The appointment of a new police superintendent is a good opportunity to air some weighty thoughts on the subject of the police. We do not aim to criticize, since those of us who are on guard are unlike anyone else when it comes to respect for authority, as was set forth by our ancient sages who said that if not for fear of the authorities people would be at each other's throat. The authorities are represented, so to speak, by the police. If it were not for the police, people would indeed be at each other's throat, and there is no need to elaborate on this point.

The job of supervising the police and of fulfilling all that society expects of it is one of the most difficult positions in the country. And, it might be added, it is least appreciated by the citizens, both those who need the police in times of trouble and those who expect more of it as a watchdog of internal security as well as the organization in charge of external security and the war against terrorism.

In recent years, the police force has had to take on another job, which it sometimes has to confront on an unequal footing: the war against the underworld, which has become very noticeable. This is one of the most difficult tasks it has been given, and it is an endless task. The underworld has a shocking way of growing. The atmosphere has a lot to do with it. Fear has contributed a lot, by which we mean the citizens' fear as they feel helpless and defenseless. The blight of drug traffic has introduced murder to the scene, and we cannot ignore this phenomenon, which affects those on the edge of society. People do not end up on the edge all of a sudden. Deterioration is a prolonged process, like that of a bad child.

The police force has to confront juvenile delinquency, which is also the original product of the affluent society. This society provides clients for our jails and creates a bad social scene. The police cannot treat the

problem at its source, but can only deal with what it sees. It does not deal with education, and it is not set up to do so. One ought to remember that not all those who reach the ranks of the police really belong there. There is a certain reluctance on the part of the public to join the police force. There are many reasons for this. This editorial is not trying to depress the new superintendent, Herzel Shapir, or even add to his depression; although, this is all being brought up at the time when he responds to the challenge. The goal is, after all, to say that as big and as complicated as the job is, so are the expectations of society. The police force can take credit for many successes, but it is far from able to meet its obligation fully of protecting the man on the street, recovering his sense of security and maintaining law and order. The police should also be on good terms with the public, and this, after all, is a rather complex society. Sometimes the police have to come in as an arbitrator between the feuding sides. They are called upon to serve as policeman and judge alike. The editors would like to wish the new superintendent success in his new position. His success is in the interest of us all. All of society is supposed to respect the authorities. Otherwise, we would be at each other's throat.

8646

CSO: 4805

AMOS HOREV SPEAKS OUT ON CURRENT ORDNANCE ISSUES

Tel Aviv MA'ARKHOT HIMUSH in Hebrew No 71, Oct 79 pp 2, 4-5

[Interview with Brig Gen (Mil.) Amos Horev, president of the Technion, by Ilan Shkhorí--date and place not given]

[Text] The army cannot function without the reinforcing echelon of the professionals. At the height of its friendship with France, it was proposed that we build a troop carrier and tank in Israel according to a French design. One of the largest ordnance corps projects in Israel to recondition and strengthen tanks was originally designed and built with the goal of independently manufacturing the British tank "Chieftain." Great caution must be exercised with regard to decisions which are likely to weaken the professional backbone of Zahal (the Israeli Army). Despite the peace agreements, we must maintain maximum efficiency of our defense structure.

[Question] Amos Horev, 5 years have passed since you left military life as head of the quartermaster corps and before that as the chief ordnance officer. Today, looking at it from the outside, what in your opinion is the central problem facing Zahal?

[Answer] One of the central problems of Zahal, if not the most important one, is the issue of professional manpower. For a long time, I have been concerned about the goals to develop a professional manpower pool in Israel, goals which have a great influence on Zahal in maintaining the capability of arms and safeguarding their technical fitness. There have been many "runaways" from the technical professions. At present, the State of Israel and Zahal do not have a technological reserve which can meet all the needs at all levels, and I see a great danger in this phenomenon. Zahal's problem is not simply to acquire more or less sophisticated weaponry, but to maintain these weapons. The acquisition of weapons systems and their maintenance are two complementary activities, and there is no doubt that the army cannot function without a professional echelon of maintenance.

[Question] How can this difficulty be overcome?

[Answer] We will not overcome this problem by bringing in workers from Cyprus, Greece or other countries. We are faced with a serious problem, but it is not a general lack of manpower.

Israel's population at present numbers approximately 3.5 million people. In a work force of 1.3 million, it is certainly possible to find the workers that the technical economy and Zahal need. There is, of course, the option of solving the problem by improving the efficiency of the system. However, it would be inaccurate to say that by increasing the efficiency of the system we can do with 30 percent less manpower because, in order to improve the efficiency of the system, we would need professionals at a very high level, and this is a kind of vicious circle.

There is, however, a simpler solution. At present, many professionals, among them senior officers in the ordnance corps or in other professional corps, leave the army at around the age of 40, when they are at the peak of their professional ability, to begin civilian careers. Why should an ordnance man at this age leave after having accumulated over the years a great deal of knowledge and experience in this work and in solving professional problems? The situation of this ordnance man is not comparable to that of the paratrooper who leaves his regiment at a similar age in order to begin a new life. This situation should be handled differently, especially when the ones who are leaving are senior officers.

[Question] Mr Horev, you have not hidden, at least in the realm of those making security decisions, your active opposition to the manufacture of the "Chariot" tank and to the reasoning that underlay the design of this tank. Why?

[Answer] I do not want to get into a public argument on this subject. This is not the place, and it is certainly not the appropriate time. I must say, though, that I had several reservations regarding Brigadier General Tal's views concerning the planning and production of the "Chariot." I had objections concerning the timetable of the over-all process and what could be deduced from it. I expressed my opinions and reservations to those who make the decisions.

[Question] But you are convinced of the adequacy of the design and production of arms in Zahal?

[Answer] Of course. One thing we have proven without a doubt, and that is that we must develop complex and sophisticated weapons in an exceptional manner. We have the personnel and means to do this. There were times when we did not believe that we were capable of doing it. Today things are different. We have developed various kinds of arms: air-to-air missiles, ocean-to-ocean missiles, communications systems, munitions, cannon, armor. It is hard to believe this when we look back and ask ourselves: What did we actually know 20 years ago? There is no doubt that we have made great strides. Although we have not attained the needed quantitative scope, we

have accumulated vast experience. I have always believed that in the areas of research, development and manufacturing, we have no reason for feelings of inferiority in comparison with other countries.

[Question] Does the planning and production of the "Chariot" constitute our first experience in designing heavy armor?

[Answer] In the past, we had several chances to manufacture large weapons. At the height of our friendship with France, it was proposed that we manufacture tanks and troop carriers in Israel according to a French design. A few French generals came to Israel, professional army commanders, to express their views to the defense minister and the chief of staff, but nothing came of it.

[Question] And aside from that?

[Answer] There were other opportunities. At the end of the seventies, we were carrying on very advanced negotiations with the British about the production of the "Chieftain" tank in Israel. Everything was set, including the base for production, and we had arrived at the very eve of the signing of an agreement when suddenly the British "backed down" for political reasons.

One of the largest ordnance corps works in Israel for the reconditioning and maintenance of tanks was planned and built originally as a base for the manufacture of the "Chieftain" tank. At that time we received two "Chieftain" tanks for tests, and the agreement was that subsequently we would begin production. At the same time, Libya also asked for tanks of this kind, and the deal was canceled. The benefit to us in this whole matter involved the construction of a mighty enterprise for the production of heavy industry--a project capable at present of producing any tank from a "Hepton" to the improved "Centurion" and every one of their parts, even the most complex.

[Question] Did the collapse of the deal with the British on the manufacture of the "Chieftain" cause Zahal to consider developing its own tank?

[Answer] From the point of view of the idea, you could say that that is correct. We always wanted to produce a tank in Israel. There was a period when we were waiting for the chance that the Germans would propose that we manufacture the "Leopard" tank, but this also did not work out. Of course, all this time the desire grew within us to design and make one ourselves. Although we did not think about basic original systems, like an engine, the fact is that despite everything we got there.

[Question] Mr Horev, what is unique about Zahal's ordnance corps as compared to similar professional corps in other armies?

[Answer] The obstacles that the ordnance corps must face in Zahal are not just simple obstacles but ones which stem from the fact that the weapon is

on the battlefield. The ordnance corps know that they must make maximal use of the weapons and that when a weapon is damaged in battle it must be immediately restored to action because there is no substitute. In addition, there are other differences. In the United States, for example, there is a logistics command, and its structure is completely different from the structure of Zahal's forces.

[Question] Are you in favor of switching to such a structure?

[Answer] Absolutely not. I am aware that in Zahal they are considering reorganization, and I do not go along with this plan. One must be very cautious about making decisions which may weaken the professional backbone in Zahal. It must be remembered that without an ordnance corps, Zahal could not function for even an hour.

[Question] Amos Horev, how do you view the next war, if, in fact, one breaks out?

[Answer] That depends on when it breaks out. If the war starts next year or in the near future, it will be a war of more: more soldiers, more cannon, more tanks and more missiles. In its essence, however, in its principles, it will not differ from the Yom Kippur war. What will characterize it will be its great intensity. If the war takes place in the more distant future, and I am speaking about at least 20 years away, then it is impossible today to anticipate and estimate what types of weapons will be used on the battlefield.

[Question] A short time ago, a peace agreement was signed with Egypt. Perhaps in the near future, peace agreements will also be signed with other Arab nations. In your opinion, should peace in some way influence Zahal's form?

[Answer] The efficiency of our defense system must be maximal because the dangers will never disappear. We cannot afford any other situation.

9348
CSO: 4805

PALESTINIANS AGREE TO HALT OPERATIONS FROM SOUTH LEBANON

London AL-HAWADITH in Arabic 9 Nov 79 p 17

[Article: "Palestinian-Syrian Agreement To Suspend Military Operations in the South"]

[Text] "We did not enter the wide door to a settlement based on the two Camp David agreements at a time when the situation in Lebanon was completely in our favor. Is it conceivable that we would enter the narrow door offered in Lebanon now?"

These were the remarks made by Syrian Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs Abd-al-Halim Khaddam in his office in the Foreign Ministry building in Damascus upon the proposal of the "American initiative." The features of this initiative became clear in the course of the visit by Phillip Habib, a high official and envoy of the American State Department, to Lebanon last month during a meeting which included Habib, a Palestinian delegation headed by Yasir 'Arafat and a Lebanese delegation representing the National Movement and the National Front.

Khaddam received Yasir 'Arafat following his arrival from Baghdad the preceding Monday evening, and held a meeting with him. One of the main subjects of this meeting was the results of the Palestinian leader's visit to the Iraqi capital and his meeting with President Saddam Husayn. The meeting was later joined by the two Lebanese delegations, whose scheduled meeting with Khaddam had been postponed from Saturday until Monday due to his illness, and then was not held during Monday morning!

The Syrian foreign minister said: "I met with Phillip Habib in order to communicate our opinion to them, that is, the Americans. Israeli interference in Lebanon with weapons, money and men through its token figures there is the direct cause of the Lebanese crisis. When that interference ceases, then the crisis will cease. In that respect, it is possible to provide assistance to Lebanon."

The participants in the "three-way meeting," which lasted roughly 2 and 1/2 hours, discussed the "French initiative" facing Lebanon and felt that it was fragile. This initiative was made on the strength of the historical

friendship between France and Lebanon, and was an attempt by France from the first to take over the issue of a Middle East settlement and serve its interests in the region.

When the matter of the entry of the army into South Lebanon was proposed, the Syrian foreign minister wanted to hear the opinion of the PLO and the Lebanese National Forces. So he listened often and spoke seldom. The Lebanese said that this proposal was accepted on the basis that it would be Lebanon's main and direct rescue operation. Official information contributed to this view. Indeed, the southerners were in agreement with the idea of this entry, which they believed would bring about their rescue. Moreover, popular pressure influenced Prime Minister Salim al-Huss, and he took a sympathetic position on the issue of the south, considering it a humanitarian problem at the same time that the Israeli military bombardment in the south is a "political bombardment" of the first order.

Nevertheless, the participants in the meeting on South Lebanon agreed on the following position: The humanitarian feelings and the political situation in the area must be reconciled. Therefore, the three sides in the meeting agree to the entry of the army into the south.

In addition, the participants decided to give assurance that resistance operations originating from Lebanese territory will be suspended, and that all military provocations of Israel will be eliminated.

The participants gave their wholehearted support to the Arab summit conference to be held in Tunis on 20 November, considering that any Arab meeting would be beneficial at the present stage and would yield positive results for the Arab situation in general. However, no Arab meeting will possess a "magic wand" with which to solve the current problems. The participants in the meeting expected that the summit will discuss the issue of the south within the framework of support for the legal authorities, concentration on the Bayt al-Din decisions "which diagnosed the disease" in the first place, and the provision of financial and economic aid to help the southerners remain steadfast.

The participants in the meeting did not express anxiety over the shift of the Lebanese problem from the realm of an Arab solution to that of an international solution, in view of the fact that by this shift the Soviet Union will become involved in the situation in Lebanon, especially in light of the results of President Hafiz al-Assad's recent visit to the Soviet Union. The Soviets gave guarantees to Syria from which it was understood that the Soviet Union is paving the ground as a sign of its determination to play a role in the region!

8591

CSO: 4802

SA'IB SALAM, WALID JUNBLAT, KAMIL AL-AS'AD FORM ALLIANCE

London AL-HAWADITH in Arabic 9 Nov 79 p 17

[Article by Walid 'Awad: "The al-As'ad-Salam-Junblat Alliance: For Internationalization With Conditions, and for Al-Huss Until He Resigns!"]

[Text] The question being asked in Beirut, especially in diplomatic circles, may not concern who profited from the al-Bastah bomb so much as the nature of the new alliance which unites former Prime Ministers Kamil al-As'ad and Sa'ib Salam and Mr Walid Junblat. The first event was a bomb which exploded and claimed innocent victims. The second event is a political time bomb which raises the question: Against whom or what will it be directed?

Former Prime Minister Salam refuses to call it an alliance, because this term has been worn out and negative in its impact. He prefers to call it political cooperation among three individuals.

Former Prime Minister al-As'ad, who places the politics of secrecy above the politics of disclosure these days, wants to keep this three-way agreement out of the limelight, and is on guard against any reference to it in his newspaper AL-RABITAH, published weekly by his Socialist Democratic Party. Walid Junblat meets any question about the matter with a smile, and is content to praise the good qualities of the other two, Al-As'ad and Salam.

The strangeness of the agreement lies perhaps in Walid Junblat's presence among two leaders whom the National Movement, to which he belongs, has classified as traditionalists, despite the socialist stamp of Mr al-As'ad's party. Experts in Lebanese politics, however, know that the political game in Lebanon has a special uniqueness. Indeed, it is a fertile area in which doctrines and ideologies are associated with individuals. Thus a doctrine sometimes takes the name of an individual, rather than the name of the individual being absorbed into the doctrine.

Taking it step by step: Will the new alliance or agreement oppose the internationalization of the Lebanese people if help is not forthcoming from the summit conference in Tunis, or will it favor internationalization?

Kamil al-As'ad personally, and likewise his party, are not against internationalization as a last resort. This was the basis of his threat which appeared in an editorial in his newspaper AL-RABITAH, that a hard choice would be necessary if contacts with the Arabs fail to yield positive results. In other words, Mr al-As'ad is in agreement with President Ilyas Sarkis in this context. In fact, the Lebanese president has apprised Al-As'ad of his messages to the kings and leaders of the Arab states before forwarding them to his envoys, Representatives Rene Mu'awwad and Zaki Mazbudi. The president of the chamber of deputies was in agreement with the veiled threat to resort to an international solution.

Moreover, Sa'ib Salam has suggested to President Sarkis on several occasions that he go to the United Nations and say: "This is the problem of my country. Now save it." This suggestion signifies a shift from the Arab solution to an international solution--a shift from Arab treatment to international treatment, and the laser beams which constitute the modern method of cauterization. But there is a difference between a shift which occurs without Arab approval and one which occurs with Arab approval, and Salam is a proponent of the latter formula--a formula which meets with understanding and mutual agreement in some Arab states.

Walid Junblat, on the other hand, envisions an international solution in which the Soviet Union is allowed to participate in the origination of any formula, as opposed to one in which the Soviets are dissociated from the formulas applied to South Lebanon and the Middle East crisis. This could now be the direction of the international harmony proceeding from SALT II in Vienna.

In this respect, the alliance is a front which includes rather than opposes President Sarkis. In fact, it may even be said that in one way or another President Sarkis is the foremost of the four in this agreement.

Again taking it step by step: Is the new alliance opposed to the Al-Huss government, or a cover for it?

Actually, it is difficult at this point to sort all this out. The government is an Al-As'ad-Salam government. However, it is a Salam government inasmuch as its head, Salim al-Huss, is supported by Sa'ib Salam against any other would-be leader. On more than one occasion, this position has caused difficulties for Al-Huss at meetings of the Islamic grouping. The government is also a Junblat government by virtue of Bahij Taqi-al-Din and the friendship of 'Ali al-Khalil--and indeed, the friendship of Prime Minister al-Huss above all. But on the other hand, the three, Al-As'ad, Salam and Junblat, are against hegemony--pardon the Chinese expression--over the government from the B'abda palace. They are also against the singling out of the ministers in committee meetings, or against the security meetings held by President Sarkis in the B'abda palace with the most important absentee being, for example, the minister of interior!

All this is predicated on the survival of the government. That is to say, the government is above all a government of the chamber of deputies. But if it occurs to the prime minister to threaten to resign--and he is said to have done that when faced with the intensification of the mazut [heavy fuel oil] crisis and increased smuggling of this substance abroad--then his replacement must be someone whose characteristics are clear, and someone who commands respect and does not force matters with a friendly settlement. In the view of Kamil al-As'ad and Walid Junblat, Salam's accession to the prime ministership, whether willingly or unwillingly, would free the country from many negative factors, and it is possible that in preparation for such a phase, Al-As'ad and Junblat will undertake to clear Salam's road to the palace of the obstacles which are hidden here and there.

What is required in the new alliance, therefore, is strong government which is able to withstand the next phase which the country will enter following the Arab summit conference, now that negative security and economic factors have begun to take a heavy toll on the country, beginning with the basic facilities of the state. For when the citizens are deprived of security, good bread and the most basic means of life, and are victims for the traps laid by all the different "mafias"--foremost among them the "mafia" of control over the daily morsel--then the need for strong government is the pressing national desire.

While awaiting the summit conference, sincere individuals hope that disgust does not overwhelm Salim al-Huss, and we get out of a conference crisis only to enter a crisis of government.

8591

CSO: 4802

QADHDHAFI'S AFRICAN POLICY REVIEWED, STUDIED

Paris AL-NAHAR AL-'ARABI WA AL-DUWALI in Arabic 12-18 Nov 79 pp 20-21

[Article by Bassam Tayyarah: "Player of Contradictions on the Chessboard of the African Continent"]

[Text] Libya, like Algeria, Morocco and Egypt, plays a dual role on the African continent by virtue of its geographical position and its sensitivity to movements around it. What is this role, what is the policy that defines it, and what are Qadhdhafi's goals which at times cost him so dearly?

Libyan diplomacy in Africa is characterized by many pockets of resistance. Following the October 1973 war and the revolution, Libya constantly endeavored, by means of various forms of financial and oil support, to get the leaders of the African states to sever their relations with Israel. This policy was successful in some states, the most prominent of which at the time was Uganda. In the wake of the effects of the October war--especially the dreadful increase in the price of oil, the victims of which were above all the poor Third World countries, and especially the African states--Libya sought to draw the international political wave to its side. Brandishing the oil weapon, it tipped the scale in most African states toward a severing of relations with Israel.

The African states kept waiting for the results of the financial promises which had been showered upon them. Libya was one of the first Arab states to move in Africa, and the Bank of Arab-African Cooperation was established with the participation of Saudi Arabia, the Gulf states and Libya.

In contrast to the meager Arab activity directed toward Africa, Libya's policy was distinguished by energetic action and active diplomacy in the African capitals.

This activity was usually accompanied by large amounts of aid, ranging from financial aid and cooperation agreements, to the provision of weapons, all the way to manpower, as was the case in Uganda when Libya paid an enormous price for that brief attempt to save the regime of Idi Amin, the "believing president."

The dream of expanding the domain of Islam and spreading the Islamic appeal are among Qadhafi's foremost concerns. Thus, from Cameroon to Uganda and from Niger to Central Africa, the capitals and other cities saw mosques and Islamic centers spring up over a period of years--not to mention the broadcasts which spread the Islamic appeal abroad and taught the Arabic language. Agreements with the African states included the condition that radio stations be established which would broadcast in Arabic and spread the Islamic appeal.

For example, there was an agreement with Niger which called for the establishment of the largest radio station in Africa whose broadcasts would cover the entire continent. Thus, in a short time, some African states saw their leaders converted to the Islamic religion. These included Idi Amin and Bokassa I, the latter renounced Islam after only a few months.

The African States Become Suspicious

Financial aid, as well as support for some specific liberation and political movements, remained the main elements of Libyan policy in the continent. Observers in the West labeled this approach the "Libyan petrodollar policy."

However, this aid was always tied to policies and issues sanctioned by Tripoli. Libya's long-term financial loans in the African capitals and other cities were distributed to large numbers of citizens, and most of these loans were made without any tie to particular regimes. Such was the case in Nouakchott, where the Libyan Arab Bank distributed financial aid without the knowledge of the authorities. This policy, along with Libya's direct aid to organizations, aroused suspicion, doubt and sensitivity among the African states concerned, especially since most of them are plagued with internal problems and opposition in the form of armed or political movements.

Reversal of Roles

Libya has played important roles in many African liberation movements, most prominently in Chad, which had witnessed a total and universal reversal of roles and positions. After supporting Hissein Habre, the former leader of the Frolinat (National Liberation Front), Libya shifted its support to Goukouni Oueddei, who succeeded Habre with Libya's strong help after Tripoli and Hissein Habre had a difference of opinion as a result of Habre's statements concerning Libyan expansion in the prefecture of Aozou, the strip along the contested common border.

Afterward, Goukouni united with Hissein Habre in forming an alliance to oppose Asil Ahmad, Libya's new man in the Chad conflict.

The reasons for these reversals of alliances can always be traced back to the racial and religious division in Chad, since the northern region adjoining Libya is Moslem. This area remained remote from the centers of administration after independence and throughout the rule of Tombalbaye. The division between the northern and southern regions was aggravated following the Frolinat's success, achieved with Libyan support, in directing numerous strikes at the Chadian government's army. This caused a split in the army, the majority of which was made up of southerners. Therefore, some people began to speak of partitioning Chad and forming a federal or confederal union between the two sides.

The southerners accuse Qadhdhafi of attempting to extend Islam over southern Chad by means of the north Chadian liberation forces in order to establish a greater Islamic state extending from the border of Mali to northern Chad and including Cameroon and some parts of Niger.

This idea dominates many African circles, which speak of Libya's backing of the "Grouping of Democrats in Mali" movement, led by Medina Soumbounou, which is trying to overthrow the regime of Moussa Traore.

Medina Soumbounou, who is living in Tripoli, speaks of a union composed of Togo, Benin and Mali (united by the Islamic religion). He calls his scheme the "Islamic Coast Union."

In addition, Qadhdhafi, along with Algeria, supports the Polisario movement with weapons and materiel. However, the question on everyone's lips is why Qadhdhafi has not yet recognized the Saharan state despite his positions in support of the Polisario.

The Eritrean liberation movement, on the other hand, wonders why Libya backs the regime of Mengistu Haile-Mariam in Ethiopia which is fighting the liberation movement. Is it because of Soviet backing or Soviet pressure?

Conflicting Positions

Libya's position on the Horn of Africa is rife with contradictions. It has sided with a regime which embraces Marxism-Leninism against an Arab liberation movement. In addition to support from the eastern communist bloc and South Yemen, the Ethiopian regime enjoys strong backing from Libya. Is this an attempt to gratify the Soviet giant and maintain a strong relationship with it, thereby averting the danger of a collapse similar to those which have befallen many African leaders in the absence of support from one or the other of the two giants? Or is it that the presence of Libya's big neighbor, Egypt, forces Qadhdhafi to seek such support no matter how contradictory his position becomes, with a view to the great importance which the Soviet Union attaches to the regime of Mengistu Haile-Mariam in Ethiopia?

Far away from the Horn of Africa, Libya's African policy remains interconnected with the aims of resistance to all outside interference in African affairs. This is what brought Libyan and Algerian leaders together on the issue of Zaire when French and Belgian divisions were sent to suppress the Katangan gendarmes' movement to defend the important province of Shaba, as well as on the operation to depose Bokassa I, in which France played a major role. These events have caused great tension in Libyan-French relations recently. Sources report that Libya has held up its payment of some obligations to French companies as a signal that this weapon could be used against any foreign interference.

But observers regard it as unlikely that French-Libyan relations will deteriorate further, because both sides share a common interest in avoiding such a development. France needs Libyan oil, and its exports to Libya are a basic means of offsetting the costs of the imported oil. Moreover, the opening up of Libya to Western Europe, especially France, constitutes an economic outlet as well as an avenue for non-Soviet modern weapons which will enable Libya to escape situations similar to its situation in the Horn of Africa and ward off the specter of eventually having to diversify its sources of armament, as happened to Sadiat's Egypt in the past and to Somalia more recently.

8591

CSO: 4802

CIRCUMSTANCES ENGULFING OULD DADDAH'S RELEASE DISCUSSED

London AL-HAWADITH in Arabic 2 Nov 79 p 27

[Article by Huda al-Husayni: "They Released Ould Daddah and Arrested His Followers"]

[Text] Somewhere in Paris and amidst his family (his wife and three sons), a lean, pale-faced man was following the developments in his country and his area. He is Mokhtar Ould Daddah, a former Mauritanian president. Bitterness was devouring the features of that calm face that maintained its calm throughout 14 months of detention after the coup that had toppled Ould Daddah on the charge of [responsibility for] the economic collapse which Mauritania experienced and the charge of being more pro-French than necessary. It was said at the time that these charges were disseminated to provide a cover for the state which made the coup, namely France itself.

On 10 July 1978, Mauritanian ex-President Mokhtar Ould Daddah was placed under house arrest and on 2 November 1979, he arrived in the French capital where an atmosphere of excitement surrounded the event. The Mauritanian Government continued to deny reports of ex-President Ould Daddah's release for a full week.

Now that the news of Ould Daddah's release has been confirmed, does his release have anything to do with the recent developments witnessed by Mauritania? How did the Mauritanian ex-President spend the period of his detention and where has Mauritania reached meanwhile?

First, why was Mokhtar Ould Daddah released? An informed Arab source has told AL-HAWADITH: It is well-known that most of the Arab states (especially Saudi Arabia) and of the African and European states intervened for his release but the Mauritanian officials paid the matter no attention.

After the deterioration of the situation in the Western Sahara and in Central Africa, France had to listen to the advice of its friend the president of the Ivory Coast, Houfouet-Boigny, who asked the French with disapproval: How can you impose Bokassa on us and not compel Mauritania to release Ould Daddah? A reliable French source says that French President

Giscard d'Estaing personally contacted Khouna Ould Haidalla, the head of the Mauritanian Government, and asked him to fulfill the promise he had made during his visit to France on the 18th and 19th of last month. Because of the need of the current Mauritanian leaders for the French political and military support, they found themselves forced to perform this humanitarian act toward Ould Daddah.

Ould Daddah's ouster from power has not turned Mauritania into a strong country economically. Rather, the split among its leaders has furthered divided the country. Likewise, Ould Daddah's release has caused a lot of problems among the Government members themselves.

The decision to release Ould Daddah was taken by only two of the Mauritanian Government's members, namely Prime Minister Khouna Ould Haidalla and Ahmed Ould Abdallah, the chief of military staff and the minister of defense (a relative of the Mauritanian minister of foreign affairs who has the same name). Even the military commander of the province in which Ould Daddah was kept under detention did not learn of his release. What is more, the minister of the interior learned the news from an AFP report.

When the news spread, the Military Council which has been ruling Mauritania for 10 days (from 8 to 18 November) met and its members could not reach agreement on how to phrase a communique stating that Ould Daddah had been released.

So, no communique has been issued yet. Rather, the problems have intensified and the exchange of accusations by the Military Council members has escalated. The reason is that when they ousted Col Moustapha Ould Saleck (who had led the coup against Ould Daddah) on the second of last July, the members agreed that no decision would be taken on any former Mauritanian official except through agreement among all of them. But the release of Ould Daddah has showed that the prime minister and the minister of defense do not trust the other members.

As a reaction to this act, a faction in the Mauritanian Government has arrested Ould Daddah's friends on the charge of planning a military coup. The most prominent current prisoners are Hamdi Ould Mouknass, the minister of foreign affairs under Ould Daddah (he was arrested in Nouadibu?) and Ahmed Mohamed Saleh who for 13 years assumed the post of acting head of state whenever Ould Daddah was absent from the country (arrested in Chinguetti).

How did Ould Daddah spend his imprisonment period and who was against his release?

Ould Daddah was jailed in the area of Oualata. He lost 14 kilograms and almost died when he remained sick for 15 days, his temperature rising to 40 degrees centigrade in a cell with a temperature of 45 degrees centigrade. Col Ould Saleck, who was then the president of the republic, turned down a

request by the physicians to transfer Ould Daddah at least to a hospital in (Nouadibu). (When overthrown, Ould Saleck developed a kind of insanity and is now living in the village of Kiffa, in southern Mauritania, which has a population of 300. He roams the streets and when he sees an aircraft flying in the sky he says: This is me when I was president of the republic).

Ould Daddah's release came as a disturbing surprise for those who had exerted efforts to turn down the requests for his release. One of those most disturbed is Col Ould Boukhreiss, Algeria's strongman in the Mauritanian army and Ould Zamel, "who represents Algeria in the Mauritanian Government." It is the view of both men that Ould Daddah's release may change the political equation in Mauritania. This is why observers say that the arrest of Ould Daddah's friends after the release of Ould Daddah has been made so that the Mauritanian Government may not lose Algeria's confidence.

Ould Daddah's friends in Paris say that he is not thinking, at least presently, of returning to power but that Mauritania's current situation frightens, even horrifies, him. It is true that Mauritania has steered clear off the war throughout 14 months but it has never in its history been internally divided as it is now. His friends also say that his political vision is clear and his ideas are firm and that he still believes that there is no place for a state in the Sahara. It is his opinion that the Algiers agreement concluded by Mauritania with the Polisario and in which Mauritania ceded the southern part of the Sahara is a horrible agreement that constitutes an insult to Mauritania.

One of Ould Daddah's friends has told AL-HAWADITH: "He is a pious man who knows no malice and a poor man who owns nothing. When those staging the coup found nothing against him, they turned to his wife and made accusations against her. However, we can assert that she did not interfere in politics."

8494

CSO: 4402

EFFECTS OF U.S. DECISION TO SUPPLY COUNTRY WITH WEAPONS DISCUSSED

London AL-HAWADITH in Arabic 2 Nov 79 pp 30, 33

[Article by Sulayman al-Farzali: "U.S. Armament of Morocco; Brzezinski Finds in Party to Honor Saudi Ambassador Fat on Piece of Bread; U.S. Decision Revolved Around Option to Weaken Ally or to Strengthen Him as Means for Negotiation; King Hassan Has Learned Lesson That Concession Only Leads to Further Concession"]

[Text] The argument was heated at the conference room of the U.S. Department of State, even though Cyrus Vance maintained his well-known calm throughout the meetings. The two arguing teams are led by Harold Sounders on the one side and Richard (Musa) on the other. The subject of the argument is the war in the Western Sahara, the Algerian-Moroccan relations and the U.S. role in North Africa.

Harold Sounders, head of the Middle East Desk at the U.S. Department of State, took the side of Morocco and Richard Musa, the head of the African team at the department, took Algeria's side. The spiritual father of this African team is Andrew Young, the former ambassador to the United Nations.

The conferees agreed on two points and disagreed on the method and the results. The first point on which agreement was reached is that Morocco, led by King Hassan II who is an ally of the United States, cannot be abandoned. The second point over which there was consensus was that what is required is to achieve a negotiated solution between Algeria and Morocco.

Brzezinski, President Carter's national security adviser, was not absent from the picture, nor was the CIA. This third team, i.e. the security team, was present by proxy and by its effect on the president's final decision [sic]. This third team did not say what it wanted but stated instead what it did not want. Brzezinski exerted side efforts so that the decision may not be taken under the "complex of appeasing" the current of the third world in which the scales are tipped in favor of Algeria, thus causing the decision to be harmful to Morocco and not beneficial in winning over Algeria because of weak decision of the kind would cause the United States to lose guaranteed friendship with Morocco and would not guarantee a firm friendship with Algeria.

The question of negotiation is the second point on which agreement was reached. Here, the discussion probed deeply, according to the information gained from the press comments. The fundamental question asked was the question: Which facilitates the negotiation process: For your ally to be strong or to be weak? The mere posing of this question means that there are cases in which the United States resorts to weakening its allies to compel them to negotiate!

But the issue is different insofar as Morocco is concerned because weakening Morocco or permitting it to slide into a state of weakness will not facilitate pushing Morocco toward negotiation as much as it will expose it to danger. On the basis of this logic, the sounder option is to push Algeria toward negotiation by strengthening Morocco.

When on 16 October 1979 the discussion file reached the (General State Policy Revision Commission) in the White House to sift and purify the file and to conclude from it a recommendation on which President Carter is to base his final decision, it was evident that the security team had won the round, but with a compromise resulting from the presence of legislative complications, the most important of which is the fact that the U.S. administration had reduced at the outset of last summer weapon sales to Morocco from 45 million dollars to 30 million dollars only.

The compromise was suggested by Brzezinski after he had felt a behind-the-scene Saudi desire to strengthen Morocco so that a settlement may be reached. The formula with which Carter's national security adviser came up called for supplying Morocco with certain offensive weapons but not in quantities that give it the opportunity to negotiate from a position of strength.

However, Brzezinski had been waiting for the right opportunity to demonstrate the wisdom of his position. This opportunity came, according to NEW YORK TIMES commentator William Safire, at the party given by Ali Ben Jalloun, the Moroccan ambassador in Washington, in honor of Faysal al-Hujaylan, the new Saudi ambassador (former ambassador in London). That party was attended by three senators, Brzezinski and Frank Carlucci, the CIA deputy director. When toasts were exchanged, the Saudi ambassador underlined the firm fraternal ties between the Saudi and Moroccan kingdoms, asking the Americans clearly to extend a helping hand to King Hassan. This was the phrase, according to Safire, which was tantamount to the "mother's milk" or the "fat on a piece of bread," as we say, insofar as Brzezinski was concerned.

On the following day, President Carter decided to supply Morocco with six Rockwell Bronco aircraft, a number of assault Cobra helicopters and other weapons valued at 200 million dollars. It has been understood that Saudi Arabia will pay more than two-thirds the sum. But President Carter did disregard Morocco's request for mobile radar units capable of detecting infiltration occurring at several points simultaneously.

The Moroccans say that the Polisario served the U.S. decision with its recent attack on the town of Semara, relying on Cuban military expertise

and aid at a time when the U.S. sensitivity to Cuba is high. As for Algeria which has been aroused by the U.S. decision, it has disavowed the Semara operation, pointing out that the area is 250 kilometers away from the Polisario concentration in Tindouf whereas it is only 50 kilometers away from the Mauritanian borders. Algeria has thus indicated that the Polisario carried out the operation from Mauritania. There are those who say that Algeria has wished to imply to the Americans that it does not have full control over the Polisario.

Algeria has countered by sending a high-level military delegation to the Soviet Union where Moscow has promised, in a joint communique issued in the name of the two parties, to strengthen Algeria and has supported its viewpoint on the Sahara issue.

King Hassan takes and demands in the style of Habib Bourguiba, the great struggler. As soon as he was certain of the U.S. decision, he declared that he will accept nothing less than a clear and decisive victory in the Sahara, to be followed by negotiations. A dispatch from AL-HAWADITH bureau in Paris says that in a short interview with the French television last Tuesday, the Moroccan monarch appeared to be clearly relaxed, puffing away the smoke of his expensive Cuban cigar, even though he used to smoke French cigarettes previously.

In this regard, the expectation of Democratic Senator George McGovern (who ran against Nixon in the 1972 elections and who was the target of the Water-gate scandal) that giving Morocco offensive weapons will push it more toward intransigence than toward negotiation, thus taking the side of those calling for weakening the ally to compel him to negotiate--this expectation has proven true.

Some Moroccans enthusiastic for the king's position toward the Sahara say that Hassan has learned the lesson that concession only leads to further concession. These Moroccans say that had the king not ceded his demand for Mauritania, had he refrained from recognizing it as an independent state and, finally, had he not acknowledged its control of one-half the Sahara, the ongoing war would not have occurred. Had the king seized Mauritania, he would have seized the Sahara and perhaps parts other than the Sahara, this being a reference to the border area disputed with Algeria (Tindouf area).

The Mauriticians are now afraid that matters will run in a counter-circle and this is why they have asked France for a military force to be stationed in Nouadhibou port (150 elements). Morocco has not gained control of the entire Sahara and if it establishes its control there, then Mauritania will by necessity find itself under the Moroccan control, especially since its internal situation is shaky as a result of the constant fluctuations caused by the war. Some Moroccan officials do not even hesitate to say that Mauritania has ended as a state and that its future is tied to the fate of the struggle in the Sahara.

After acquiring the U.S. offensive weapons, King Hassan is now capable, according to some French sources, to implement what he declared 2 years ago concerning "the right to hot pursuit" against the Polisario inside the Algerian and Mauritanian territories. Should this happen, it will constitute a qualitative development in the struggle because it will be a direct military confrontation between Morocco and Algeria. Even though the United States is satisfied with the Arab mediations between the two sides, especially the Saudi mediation, and with the involvement of new sides in this mediation, there are in the U.S. Department of Defense those who say that it is futile to look for a settlement before the Algerian-Moroccan clash occurs. Mediation before a clash is a mere endeavor. After a clash, mediation is a solution. The mediation should, in the opinion of these people, be American. This will not happen until Algeria acknowledges that 99 percent of the cards of the game are in the hands of the United States, exactly as Anwar al-Sadat did, thus finding Camp David waiting for him.

North Africa, according to the visualization of the U.S. strategists, is within the "U.S. Middle East precinct" and not within the "Soviet-Cuban wing of Africa."

King Hassan has played the game skillfully. He has no political troubles at home and all the parties--leftist, rightist, opposed and loyal parties--support his stance on the Sahara. His problems are economic and military. However, his wager that Saudi Arabia would reduce his economic problems and the United States his military problems has proven not to be an imaginary wager and he has begun to reap some of the fruits of this wager.

The skill of King Hassan lies in the fact that he has upturned Morocco's political map since the early 1970's. Whereas the Moroccan opposition, especially in the days of Mehdi Ben Barka constituted the Arab face of Morocco because of its relations with 'Abd-al-Nasir and the Ba'th Party, this opposition's concerns have now become local and King Hassan has become the country's Arab face. The king has relied on the army and the army leadership inherited from the French and it later became evident to him that the non-Arab leaderships were the ones plotting against him, especially Oufkir who wanted to strike the throne by striking the Arab-oriented Moroccan opposition. Only fate saved King Hassan. Had it not been so, Oufkir would have done what he wanted and would have trapped the king after wiping out the opposition.

This is why the king reached reconciliation with the opposition from an Arab position. It is from this position, according to the Moroccans who believe in this view, that the king decided to give the army an Arab image by sending troops to fight in the Golan against Israel in 1973. As soon as the king raised the slogan of liberating the Sahara and called for the Green March, he found behind him an unprecedented consensus and a united domestic front. Moreover, the delicate balance in his stance toward Egypt after the Camp David accords gives him a greater opportunity to maneuver and to prevent a pro-Algerian Arab alignment exerting pressure on him. This stance may even help him to channel the Arab pressure toward Algeria to compel it to negotiate and to settle the problems peacefully.

The Algerian protest of the U.S. armament of Morocco is natural, in the view of the Moroccans. What is not natural is Algeria's silence over the entry of French forces to Mauritania. The Algerian silence is, in the evaluation of the French [sic], agreed upon by Algiers and Paris because it prevents the domestic Mauritanian situation from deteriorating. The Mauritaniens add that this is due to two reasons: First, Mauritania needs a non-Moroccan and non-Algerian military force to demonstrate its nonalignment toward the conflict and, second, the French presence prevents partitioning the country between Morocco and Senegal which demands the areas adjacent to it and that are inhabited mostly by non-Arab blacks. There are even those among the Mauritaniens who accuse Morocco openly of intending to divide Mauritania with Senegal, even though the Moroccan officials underline their eagerness for the unity of the Mauritanian territories.

William Safire's statement that the Saudi ambassador the moved to draw the attention of the Americans to the importance of giving Morocco the necessary aid may not be true because the NEW YORK TIMES urged on that day (18 October) Carter's administration not to give Rabat military aid because the United States has no threatened interests in that area. Some U.S. reporters say that Safire, who writes in the NEW YORK TIMES, wants to give his paper an unrealistic weight in charting the U.S. policy, even though the paper is an influential one. What is true, in the opinion of the U.S. reporters, is that the U.S. administration has certain information that there are Cuban forces and experts working with the Polisario, some of whom have been brought from Ethiopia and some from South Yemen. Moreover, some members of the Polisario are being trained in Cuba.

The Polisario sources say that this is not information but an American conclusion derived from a statement by King Hassan II saying that foreign circles are making moves in the area. These sources deny decisively the presence of foreign forces with the Polisario and accuse the Americans of using this "as a pretext to interfere and to wipe us out."

Observers in Europe feel that the Algerian-Moroccan clash is imminent and that it will take place at the first Moroccan hot pursuit inside Algeria. But Prince Sa'ud al-Faysal, the Saudi minister of foreign affairs, who visited Algiers and Rabat recently is still optimistic that the situation between the two fraternal countries will not reach this point. Moreover, the Saudi sources say that the Algerians have complained of the Libyan intransigence in instigating the Polisario to exploit the opportunity to free itself of the Algerian custodianship or to balance it so that Algeria may not be able to impose a settlement on the Polisario, as was the situation more than a year ago.

Even though the Moroccans have their doubts about this Algerian claim and interpret it as an attempt to scale down the Moroccan intensity against Algeria and to push Rabat toward further moderation so as to avert a direct confrontation, the Saudi mediator believes, regardless of the soundness or invalidity of either claim, that Libya must be neutralized under all circumstances. There are those who believe that the Saudi monarch's visit to Tripoli may have perhaps contributed toward this direction.

The Arab mediators will increase in number after the U.S. armament of Morocco the same way they increased in number when al-Sadat declared his readiness to help Morocco. At the time, the Saudi mediator was joined by other mediators from Tunisia, Syria and the PLO. However, the pressure will be on Algeria this time.

8494

CSO: 4802

HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS DECRIED

Casablanca AL-MUHARRIR in Arabic 18 Nov 79 p 8

[Article: "Human Rights; the Gap Between Principles and Fact"]

[Text] Our newspaper has gotten copies of dozens of letters sent to the prime minister, the minister of justice and the Ministry of the Interior about the condition of a political detainee in Morocco, Abraham al-Sarfati. The purpose of the writers of these letters, most of whom are members of European branches of the International Amnesty Organization, is to draw the attention of officials to the deteriorating state of health of this detainee, and to inquire as to what steps the government is going to take about this situation that is incompatible with the most basic prerequisites for respecting human rights and, lastly, to urge that al-Sarfati be released.

It should be pointed out that international public opinion has been wondering for a long time about the grave tampering with human rights in our country. This has shown up in a number of ways and the concern has been intensified by the various breaches of political freedoms. The past few months has seen a wave of arrests in union circles and the expulsion of many persons in the fields of education and health and other labor sectors. There are more than 1,200 families suffering from these actions. One thing that drove home this abnormal situation was the death under torture of a young man, Muhammad Karinah, a USFF fighter.

So, our country is still completely unrespecting of basic freedoms and everyone is still demanding that every possible effort be exerted in this regard. The conclusion we draw from this flood of letters taking a position of solidarity with the political detainee, Abraham al-Sarfati is that our masses are still a long way from enjoying true democracy since how can one talk of democracy when families are dying deprived of their livelihood and dozens of fighters are still facing unknown fates in the gloom of the jails.

Making the matter worse and driving it home is the fact that a number of countries of the so-called third world have taken steps this year to offer amnesty of political prisoners but we, however, have seen no trace of this

in our country. Accordingly, Morocco remains as one of only a few countries living with signs of persons in political exile and under arrest because of their ideas and unable to practice their professions. All this would form a tremendous and valuable force were it used to build a new Morocco that needs the efforts of all its national skills.

8389

CSO: 4402

INTERIOR MINISTER QUESTIONED ON PERSECUTION OF USFP BY LOCAL AUTHORITIES

Casablanca AL-MUHARRIR in Arabic 26 Nov 79 pp 1,8

Article: "Actions of Local Authorities in Certain Quarters and Violations of Public and Democratic Freedoms and Human Rights Are the Subject of Questions by the Socialist Union of People's Forces Opposition"

Text Thursday's session of the Chamber of Deputies was set aside for answering verbal questions. There had been 25 questions scheduled for study in this session but the minister of the interior asked that answers to them be deferred except for a question by Muhammad Bessa'id about actions by local authorities toward offices of the Socialist Union of People's Forces [USFP] in a number of provinces and the harassment, persecution and maltreatment of USFP fighters at the hands of local authorities. The question by Brother Muhammad Bensa'id in the name of the USFP opposition was phrased as follows:

The repetition and the singular nature of the moves of the local authorities against the offices of the USFP party now prompts us to put a question to the government to explain the facts of the following situations to the chamber of deputies and to public opinion:

1. In Hadd El Rawadi, in Imzourhene Caïdat and Al Hoceima Province, the authorities rejected a request to set up an office for the USFP branch in that caïdat.

Even though the papers filed met all legal prerequisites which should have warranted giving the party officials a provisional voucher, the papers were returned with a rejection.

2. In Skoura District in Ouarzazate Province, the authorities went so far as to use civil force to prevent the opening of party headquarters in contravention of all constitutional and legislative statutes.

3. In El Rashidiyah, the authorities demonstrated the same treatment, using the same means to the same end.

4. On 28 July 1979 the city of Ben Sliman was witness to incidents about which the least that can be said is that they show the truth about the extent to which public freedoms are respected in this country and the extent to which there is respect for the constitutional and legislative statutes that contain these freedoms and their principles.

The USFP headquarters was attacked and its door broken in.

Two iron banks were attached to the door as a sign that it was not to be opened.

Some members of the office were put in the trunk of the khalifa's car and were driven through the streets of the city to humiliate them publicly.

There was an attack on the home of Brother 'Arif, an official member, by the authorities' men who beat up him and members of his family. He was then mistreated by the khalifa who crowned that by personally beating and kicking him until he fainted, 'Arif still being in the process of recuperating from heart surgery.

Following these incidents which have been repeated and have grown in number and given their similarity although they happened in different provinces and cities, we must ask the government:

Since the laws and regulations are legislation in accordance with which the rights and duties of groups and individuals are defined:

1. What is the objective of the local authorities, the authorities of the government, in this treatment directed specifically against the offices and fighters of the USFP?
2. Are the authorities in all these quarters being innovative in the field of violation of constitutional and legislative statutes?
3. In this event, how does the government think best to cope with these "decentralized" violations and what urgent, appropriate means to deter the local officials from this "insubordination against the constitution and legislation?"

Brother Bensa'id spoke to clarify his question, stating the following:

On 21 August I directed a question to the prime minister and the foreign minister about the activities of the authorities against the USFP offices. I had thought the minister of the interior would handle the reply on behalf of the prime minister and I had hoped the prime minister would be present at this session so that I could get an answer from him as well.

In any case, my question is directed in particular at certain serious incidents which our country has witnessed in various parts of Morocco.

Had these been isolated incidents, we would have said that they were coincidence and the sort of incidents that happen or happen by mistake.

However, their repetition and their serious nature and the violation of political rights and constitutional and legislative statutes make us sound this alarm so that we may acquaint ourselves with the progress of these activities and draw some conclusions about these events.

Because time is limited, I shall confine myself to some of the incidents without mentioning all of them.

Brother Bensa'id mentioned the harassment the party had encountered in Hadd El Rawadi in Imzourhene Caidat and Al Hoceima Province, in Skoura District in Ouarzazate Province and in El Rashidiyah as related in the question but he went into the Ben Sliman incidents in detail, saying:

I shall give an example in some detail about the Ben Sliman incident, adding that there are a number of USFP officials who have in one way or another been prevented from giving lectures after the headquarters was licensed and after legal measures were taken.

The Ben Sliman incidents were distinguished by an odd character, neither in form nor in as published severity of the violations of the constitution and legislative statutes. The headquarters of the USFP () attacked by the authorities and a large number of their supporters and () door was broken in and then sealed shut with two iron bands as a sign that entry was prohibited.

The sanctity of the homes of some office officials was violated. The doors of their homes were broken in and they were taken by the pashá's khalifa in the trunk of his car and taken to the pashá's headquarters through the streets of the city as a sort of public humiliation. To be precise, there was an attack on the home of the branch clerk, an official of the office, by the authorities' men. He was beaten and punched in the khalifa's office by the khalifa at a time when this brother was in a poor state of health because he was recuperating from heart surgery.

As I said before, there have been repetitions of these incidents and we did not come straightaway to the chamber of deputies to announce them. In fact, the minister of the interior is aware of the extensive correspondence and intercessions there has been and of the meetings that have taken place in the ministry's offices about these violations. Naturally we state that the democracy we publicize and the slogans for which we raise cannot exist in this country while it practices democracy of another type.

The fact is that the presence of the USFP opposition in this chamber and in this assembly is proof of the legitimacy of the USFP's existence. Brother Bensa'id then cited several sections of the constitution,

emphasizing that no one has the right to violate the law since all Moroccans are equal before it.

The tenth section states: No one will be arrested, detained or punished except in the instances and in conformity with the procedures stipulated in the law.

It states in the second paragraph: The sanctity of the home will not be violated and it will not be searched or investigated except in accordance with the procedures and measures stipulated in the law.

These are the constitutional sections which the constitution applies to protect public freedoms and democratic rights.

With regard to statutes, the statute on public freedoms and the freedom of assemblies and parties, despite some gaps in its wording, does not give anyone the right to dissolve any party or society or to obstruct or halt their activities except through judicial writ.

We believe that there are some men in the establishment who still have a way of thinking that is totally incompatible with the basic precepts of democracy. We see this when they state without any embarrassment that the constitution is a written law and they don't concern themselves with the constitution in practice.

This statement is often made and the minister of the interior knows this because he has more means of getting information than we have. We know the particular circumstances of the instances of which we speak; he knows the state of the country and the practices of his underlings in the ministry with regard to the law and the extent to which they respect it.

These irresponsible practices and the legal violations are used as a weapon against us in all national assemblies and gatherings.

The circumstances of our country in no way permit tampering with the public freedoms guaranteed by the constitution or with the basic precepts of democracy. We must all be mobilized to protect democracy so that the domestic front will be stronger than at any time in the past. We most urgently need to strengthen, coordinate and consolidate this front.

Brother Muhammad Bensa'id closed his statement about the harassment of the USFP offices and what the USFP fighters in a number of provinces were suffering in the way of pressures and provocations and persecution to the point of beatings and mistreatment in violation of the basic principles of public and individual freedoms and in violation of basic human rights.

The minister of the interior replied that the activities of the authorities were basically focussed on the ordinance having to do with societies and that these activities were all in conformity with the law. The

minister's reply, which came in the form of a "statement of fact" of the sort which he sends to the press, was completely lacking in any reference to what the USFP fighters and officials in the provinces are being subjected to in the way of savagery, mistreatment, prison and insults at the hands of the local authorities and their supporters in a regular fashion and without regard to existing laws.

Then Aldai Ould Sidi Baba read a draft statement which he said the section chairmen had agreed to issue and to submit to the chamber for ratification. The statement concerned the events at the Grand Mosque in Mecca, criticized this criminal action and expressed the support of the Chamber of Deputies for the Saudi government.

After the statement was read, Brother 'Abdullah al-Radi intervened, saying that the USFP opposition shared the feelings of every Muslim in these circumstances and criticized the violence and the attacks on the holiest of places for Muslims, the Grand Mosque. He said that while it is the duty of the USFP opposition to criticize all criminal acts against our religious holy places, particularly during this month, the holy month, the month of respect, it is difficult for it while criticizing these immoral actions, to see the Chamber of Deputies supporting or not supporting a foreign government which it was not within its jurisdiction to support or oppose.

Aldai Ould Sidi Baba stated that every Muslim had the right to criticize this criminal action and to put his trust in the authorities who are responsible for protecting those holy places if they deserved this trust and support and this is what His Majesty and the chamber had done.

A spokesman for the independent faction said that the statement had emerged from an agreement among all parliamentary factions and that were there a parliament in Saudi Arabia, it would be been directed to it.

Brother Ibrahim Boutalib broke in with a point of order, saying: I feel it my duty to interrupt to inform the chamber of what took place in the meeting of chairmen in which I represented the USFP. It was stated from this podium that agreement had been reached on the principle of criticizing what happened in the holy place and that, in fact, is true. However, I would remind the president that I said that I was surprised by the absence of Brother al-Radi at the meeting and I questioned whether we had sufficient information about the incident. You told me, Mr President, explicitly that you did not have information. We went ahead with the idea of expressing criticism and support but we did not reach agreement on the wording. We did not say "supporting a specific government," as expressed in Brother al-Radi's objection.

The subcommittees in the chamber are still discussing the draft budget for 1980 and debate is expected to begin in a general session the end of this month.

8389
CSO: 4402

CONDITIONS AT BRANCH OF CADI AYAD SCHOOL REVEALED

Casablanca AL-MUHARRIR in Arabic 29 Nov 79 p 4

[Article by Beni Mellal: "The Cadi Ayad Branch School Is a Manifestation of Neglect, Ugliness and the Death of Conscience"]

[Text] This branch is located at the end of a quarter of tincan hovels and shacks known as "the national restoration." The occupants of these ugly, dilapidated houses live with no defined and obvious work and in almost total unemployment, engaging in trivial and unproductive, and at times, destructive work. They live among pickpockets and beggars and all types of perversions which are rife in the tincan quarters where there is a total lack of values relating to a proper way of life that influence an individual's psychological makeup and, consequently, his products, health and temperament and even the elimination of self-hatred.

With its squalid location, this branch is no better than the condition of those tinsplate houses, surrounded everywhere with garbage and sewers and human waste of all sorts here and there because of the lack of toilets, waste on which passersby stumble and students trod, students whom you can see when they arrive knocking their shoes on the ground to loosen what is clinging to them or finding the walls of the two rooms better for that.

The suffocation from the odious rotting waste inevitably spreads eye diseases and other diseases that require officials to rush to hold medical examinations, provide treatment and root out the source of these contagious diseases.

Let's go back to the two rooms and say: They are fit only for a place for tanning hides or selling charcoal. A total of 195 students take turns in them, broken down as follows:

1. The primary: Two shifts, one of 47 and the other 49.
2. The preparatory: Two shifts, one of 50 and the other 48.

They lack all basic requirements for health that would make them a place for rearing the new generation. The despicable condition of those two

rooms is not even usable for a game of blindman's buff, that game which is like the posture of an ostrich toward a hunter.

The children of today are the man of tomorrow and their education will guide what they will be in the future. They will be the people and that will be the sentence.

8389

CSO: 4402

BAR ASSOCIATION DENOUNCES ARREST OF LAWYERS

Casablanca AL-MUHARRIR in Arabic 29 Nov 79 p 8

[Article: "Communique From the Bar Association Office in Morocco About the Arbitrary Arrest of Two Professors: Hasan Belqasim and Nuzhah al-'Alawi"]

[Text] The Bar Association Office in Morocco met on Saturday, 15 November 1979, at the Bar Association headquarters in Tetouan.

After studying a number of points concerning the upcoming 14th conference of the Federation of Arab Lawyers, the provisional committee that was charged with preparing for the constituent congress of African lawyers, the new statute for the legal profession and starting work on preparing its new internal statute and the facts of the arbitrary arrest of the two professors; Hasan Belqasim and Nuzhah al-'Alawi, it released the following communique concerning the latter point:

On 13 October 1979 at exactly 1140 hours, two policement equipped with communication gear raided the apartment of Prof Hasan Belqasim of the Bar Association in Rabat. They rushed into his bedroom and, after being joined by a third person, took him off to provincial security headquarters in Rabat where he remained under arrest for a certain period before being released without being interrogated or without any charge being placed against him. When asked about the reason for the arrest, one of them replied in a threatening tone: "It's better for you not to ask why." On the same day, Prof Nuzhah from the Bar Association in Kenitra was arrested by the police in Rabat and she remained under arrest for several hours before being released without having a specific charge placed against her.

The associations to which the two professors belong raised the matter with the officials but to no avail.

These two incidents were preceded by similar incidents, the last of which was the arrest of our colleague, Prof Lahsan Boudrar from the Kenitra Bar Association for a certain period of time on 27 July 1979 by the department chief in Kenitra when he made a complaint to him verbally against a member

of the reserve force who had insulted him.

For some time now, the Bar Association has protested to officials about such behavior and has informed public opinion about some of these actions.

It again emphasizes that such arrests that are illegal in both form and substance not only violate the sanctity of defense that is considered a pillar of the judiciary but above all else and in addition to that gravely violate the basic guarantees of human rights and the principles of public and private freedoms.

The Bar Association which has for so long criticized in lawyers' conferences the theoretical and actual violations which are detrimental to legality and the principles of justice and the sovereignty of the law can but announce to public opinion that it denounces such practices, adheres to those guarantees and principles and is determined to continue to work to impose respect for them by all quarters.

8389

CSO: 4402

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

22 Jan. 1980

D.D.